The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXXI JULY, 1945 No. 2

AMERICANISM, FACT AND FICTION*

ON January 22, 1899, Pope Leo XIII addressed to James Cardinal Gibbons and the hierarchy of the United States the apostolic letter, *Testem Benevolentiae*,[1] in which he condemned, under the name of Americanism, those methods of apologetics which stressed natural virtues to the neglect of the supernatural and those notions of spiritual direction which insisted on individual inspiration and the active virtues in preference to external guidance and the passive virtues. Certain American prelates, sometimes classified as the progressive bishops, had endeavored to prevent the publication of the Pope's letter, and, when it did appear, they denied that any properly instructed American Catholics held the condemned doctrines. Their opponents in Europe and in America challenged these denials. Amidst this confusing situation the necessity of accepting the Pope's letter prevented a continuation of the controversy, but it did little to lessen the sharp feeling between the progressive prelates and their opponents. Indeed, the enforced silence, together with this inconclusive termination of the discussion, has made it difficult for students of history to distinguish fact from fiction in this Americanist controversy of the years 1895-1900.[2]

* A briefer version of this article was read as a paper at the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Chicago, December 28, 1944.

[1] Apostolic letter of Pope Leo XIII, to Cardinal Gibbons, *Testem Benevolentiae* dated January 22, 1899, the official English text of which may be read in the *Catholic World*, LXIX (April, 1899), 133-139.

[2] The definitions of Americanism are taken for the most part from the writer's article in the *Review of Politics*, V, (July, 1943), 275-301, "Americanism and Frontier Catholicism," where he examined in more detail the American background of the heresy. The most frequently quoted study of the question is that of Albert Houtin, *L'Américanisme* (Paris, 1904), which is very valuable for its

One reason for this confusion has been the feeling that the historian must take sides in the controversy. However, if the historian is to distinguish fact from fiction in the charges and counter-charges of the day, he must, above all, not merely renew the old battle. Nothing can be gained today by taking one side or the other of the controversy, and the critical searcher for truth will be content to uncover the facts of the case and let the honor or guilt fall where it may. The leaders in this notable controversy were nearly all capable, zealous men and victory or defeat for one side or the other need not imply in either group any moral delinquency or pastoral defect. But there has been confusion; and the purpose of this examination is to seek out the facts of the controversy and to clear away the mists raised by the vehemence and partisanship of the time.

In investigating the period, one is immediately aware that the terms of the controversy need some definition. In the first place, it is difficult to say exactly when the word Americanism acquired a religious meaning above its normal political and social implications. The ordinary American usage of the word, to indicate the citizen's devotion to American political institutions and ideals, was expressly excluded by Pope Leo XIII from condemnation in his apostolic letter, *Testem Benevolentiae*. Another kind of Americanism concerned with those doctrines against which the Pope's letter was directed, had acquired this name chiefly in the writings of a small group of European liberal Catholics who fostered the ideas condemned. A

---

quotations from contemporary sources but marred by the author's modernist prejudices. Adrian Fortescue's "Americanism" in *Folia Fugitiva* edited by Reverend W. H. Cologan, (New York, 1907), pp. 265-290, gives a brief summary of the controversy. Thomas P. Neill has a brief examination of the question in the *Historical Bulletin*, XXII (November, 1943) 3-6, 16-19, (January, 1944) 33-34, 42-43. Of the French historians who have treated the subject in their more general histories, the most important are Edouard Lecanuet, *La Vie de l'Église sous Léon XIII* (Paris, 1930), chapitre XII, "L'Américanisme en France," pp. 544-602, and Emanuel Barbier, *Histoire du Catholicisme libéral et du Catholicisme sociale en France*, (Bordeaux, 1924), III, chapitre II, "La crise de l'américanisme," pp. 242-284. Lecanuet gives the progressive side of the controversy while Barbier represents the more conservative opinion. The complete list of writings on the subject is too long to be included here, but two other articles written after the condemnation are worthy of close consideration. They are the two essays, "The End of 'Americanism' in France," in the *North American Review* by P. L. Pechenard, CLXX (March, 1900), 420-432, and "The Genesis of Americanism," by J. St. Clair Etheridge (apparently Archbishop John Ireland), *Ibid.*, CLXX (May 1, 1900), 679-693.

third kind of Americanism, which might be called the incidentals of American Catholic life, consisted of certain tendencies and some isolated events observed in American Catholicism toward the end of the nineteenth century which these European liberals took out of their context and rationalized into the theological principles of the condemned Americanism.

This third kind of Americanism—one might say the real Americanism—has never been clearly defined but it may be classified as the effects of new world conditions on the doctrines and practices of the Catholic faith. It does not concern the essentials of Catholic doctrine or morals but only certain accidentals affected by times and places. Its existence and its indefiniteness must be recognized if one is to understand the apparently contradictory statements about Americanism made at the time of the papal letter. As a matter of fact, the bitterness of the controversy over Americanism really grew out of the efforts of certain writers and ecclesiastics to make these first and third types of Americanism, as well as the second, come under the condemnation of the Pope's letter. Thus some Americans tried to make the third type come under the papal condemnation. Only a few Europeans tried to make the papal document condemn American political ideals and they were quickly reprimanded by Pope Leo.

In this controversy it is important to distinguish as well between the European and American phases which came together, at least partially, in Rome in the final stages of the discussion. The American phase had its origin in the efforts of the progressive American ecclesiastics to Americanize the Church organization in the United States; the European phase was basically the attempt of European liberals to Americanize European Catholicism, particularly by fostering greater co-operation with republican institutions. The first was not a theological quarrel, except insofar as the progressive American ecclesiastics were accused of holding the theories of the European Americanizers in the later stages of the controversy. The second and more theological controversy was waged in French, German, and Italian periodicals between two groups who had little actual knowledge of the Church in the United States. One group claimed all the progress of the Church in the United States for certain particular doctrines which they dubbed Americanism and which they urged on European Catholics. Their opponents sought the condemnation of these same doctrines as heretical.

There were many side issues in the discussions in Europe and in the United States. Here one can sketch only a brief outline of the two main arguments with some hints of the other problems which seemed at times involved and which really caused some of the intense feeling. In the American discussion the progressive churchmen of the period were chiefly Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, Cardinal James Gibbons of Baltimore, Monsignor Denis J. O'Connell, rector of the American College in Rome, Bishop John J. Keane, rector of the Catholic University of America, Archbishop John J. Kain of St. Louis, and Bishop John Lancaster Spalding of Peoria. These men did not have any particular program for Catholic Church organization in the United States other than the decisions of the Plenary Councils of Baltimore and no two of them can be said to have had identical thoughts on all issues of the day, even when they were on the same side of a controversy; but their outspoken friendliness to American politcal and social institutions had earned for them the name of progressive clergymen in the American press.

One of the first manifestations of the progressive attitude was occasioned by the formation and growth of the Knights of Labor.[3] Because of the violence and secrecy associated with the Irish Land League and certain labor organizations in Europe and the Molly Maguires in this country, several of the more conservative bishops adopted an unfriendly attitude toward the Knights, even after their secret oath had been abolished. This opposition, however, became serious in 1886 when Cardinal Taschereau[4] of Quebec condemned the Knights as a secret society and sought from Rome a papal condemnation of the organization. Cardinal Gibbons, urged on by Archbishop Ireland and Bishop Keane, appealed to Cardinal Manning[5] of Westminister to assist him. When in Rome in 1887 to receive the red hat, Gibbons brought up the matter and his intervention, together with Manning's help, prevented the Roman condemnation of the Knights of Labor.

In the meantime, another controversy had broken out in New

[3] Allen Sinclair Will, *Life of Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore*, (New York, 1922.) I, 320-360. T. V. Powderly, *The Path I Trod*, (New York, 1940), pp. 347-348. Shane Leslie, *Henry Edward Manning, His Life and Labours*, (New York, 1921), pp. 351-366.

[4] *Pastoral Letter of His Grace E. A. Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec Concerning Certain Prohibited Societies*, April 19, 1886.

[5] Leslie, *loc. cit.*

York concerning the single tax doctrine of Henry George.[6] Father Edward McGlynn, pastor of St. Stephen's Church in New York City, had disobeyed Archbishop Michael A. Corrigan by his public support of George. McGlynn was suspended and Corrigan sought from Rome a condemnation of George's teachings on the grounds that they denied the right of private property. Gibbons refused to help McGlynn. However, again with the aid of Manning, he prevented the publication of any Roman condemnation of Henry George. In both of these cases Gibbons regarded the evils of the situation as temporary and he feared that papal condemnation would make the Church appear unfriendly to the laboring classes among whom were many Catholic immigrants. In the background of this and other controversies was a personal disagreement between Archbishop Ireland and Archbishop Corrigan which showed itself in political matters[7] and in such questions as the planning for the new Catholic University of America.

On the question of the Catholic parochial school [8] system and the erection of the Catholic University of America the progressive group involved itself in a complex controversy in which it could claim chief credit for the foundation of the University but had to defend itself against a charge of unfriendliness to the Catholic parochial school. Again, the chief opposition on the question of the University came from Archbishop Corrigan of New York and his suffragan, Bishop Bernard J. McQuaid of Rochester. Later the German language groups opposed the University because of the enforced resignation of Monsignor Joseph Schroeder and the opinions expressed by Dr. Thomas Bouquillon on the parochial school question. In the controversy over parochial schools Archbishop Ireland had drawn upon himself the accusation of being unfriendly to the parochial school by his address before the National Educational Association at St. Paul in 1890 in which he regretted the necessity of the separate parochial school, by his arrangements for state support of the parish schools in Faribault and Stillwater, Minnesota, and by his defense of Bouquillon's articles supporting the State's rights in education. Ireland defended himself against the charge.

[6] Will, *Gibbons*, I, 361, 378; Frederick J. Zwierlein, *The Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid*, (Rochester, New York, 1925-1927), III, 1-83.

[7] Zwierlein, *McQuaid*, III, 160-251.

[8] Daniel F. Reilly, *The School Controversy (1891-1893)*, (Washington, 1943), takes the side of Archbishop Ireland in this controversy.

Gibbon wrote to Rome in his defense and obtained for him a decree of *tolerari potest* for his Faribault-Stillwater arrangement, which, however, in the meantime had been discontinued because of non-Catholic opposition.

Behind the accusation that Archbishop Ireland was unfriendly to parochial schools, was some bitter feeling because of his opposition to foreign language schools and churches. In 1889[9], when Wisconsin passed the Bennett Law regulating public and private schools and insisting that certain classes be taught in the English language, the bishops of the Milwaukee province became the chief defenders of the parochial schools and implicitly of the German language schools. Ireland showed no sympathy with the foreign language groups in the fight. Previously, in 1886,[10] when Father P. M. Abbelen presented a petition in Rome asking that national churches in the various dioceses be granted full parochial rights, Ireland and Keane, who were in Rome in the interest of the proposed University, took quick action and had the petition rejected.

Again, in 1890 and 1891, the conventions of the German emigration societies meeting in Lucerne presented *Memorials*[11] to the Holy See on the same matters. These Lucerne *Memorials* were presented by Count Peter Paul Cahensley, the president of the convention, thus giving rise to the name Cahensleyism for the movement. Deploring the great losses to the faith among the immigrant population, the *Memorials* asked as a remedy that provisions be made for foreign representation in the American hierarchy which would afford more effective recognition to the foreign Catholic population in the country. Again, prompt action by Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland, and their friends caused the rejection of these petitions.

The leaders of the foreign language Catholics in the country did not immediately give up hope. Their press[12] became quite acrimoni-

[9] [Harry H. Heming], *The Catholic Church in Wisconsin*, (Milwaukee, 1895-1898), pp. 278-294.

[10] *Relatio de quaestione Germanica in Statibus Foederatis a Rev. P. M. Abbelen . . . Sacrae Congr. de Propaganda Fide mense novembris 1886 submissa.*

[11] Cf. A. H. Walburg, *The Question of Nationality*, (Cincinnati, 1889), and William Faerber and Innocent Wapelhorst, O. F. M., *The Future of Foreign-Born Catholics*, (St. Louis, 1884).

[12] J. T. Reilly, (Ed.) *Collections in the Life and Times of Cardinal Gibbons*, (McSherrytown, Pa., 1895), III, 1-34. The *Memorials* are also discussed in the London *Tablet* LXXVIII, 145-146, (July 25, 1891).

ous in its opposition to all Americanization, pointing to manifestations of moral and religious decline in the country and to the theological mistakes of their opponents as evidence of the evils of trying to Americanize the immigrant. They gave much attention to the progressive prelates' unwillingness to condemn certain American secret fraternal societies[13] and to their fraternization with non-Catholics in public gatherings. The first climax in this controversy over Americanization came when, on the occasion of the Columbian Exposition in Chicago, a World Parliament of Religions was held in 1893.[14] Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland, and Bishop Keane participated. The presence of representatives of almost every faith on the same platform with them and a few ambiguous accidents in the ceremonies, brought forth in the *Civiltà Cattolica*,[15] as well as in periodicals in America, the charge that the participating prelates had compromised the Catholic position by this fraternization. The bishops who had participated in the parliament denied the charge and pointed out the good that was accomplished by permitting non-Catholics to hear Catholic doctrines; but Pope Leo XIII in 1895 ruled that there should be no further participation of Catholics in such inter-faith congresses. Further, in September, 1896, Keane was removed from the rectorship of the Catholic University of America on the grounds that a definite time limit had to be established for the rectorship. Generally, however, this was viewed as an unfriendly papal action toward the progressive prelates.

Active in opposition to these policies of the progressive bishops were Archbishops Corrigan of New York and Frederick F. X. Katzer of Milwaukee, and Bishops Bernard McQuaid of Rochester, Richard Gilmour—and after his death on April 1, 1891, Ignatius Horstman—of Cleveland, Sebastian G. Messmer of Green Bay, and Winand M. Wigger of Newark. Here again no definite policy can be ascribed to the conservatives. Like their opponents, they seldom agreed on everything. Corrigan and McQuaid opposed Ireland on political problems and on the parochial school. The German prelates opposed the progressives on the national churches and schools, as well as on the parochial schools. Corrigan again was a conservative regarding secret societies and labor unions. At times other prelates

[13] Zwierlein, *McQuaid*, II, 378-474.

[14] *The World's Parliament of Religions, and the Religious Parliament Extension*, (Chicago, 1896).

[15] *Civiltà Cattolica*, V, (1895), Series XV, 119ff.

joined the opposition to the progressives on one or more of these questions. Most of the American prelates, exclusive of those named, did not participate in these controversies, devoting their efforts to the other great pastoral problems of the times.

Thus, the chief milestones in this American controversy were: the attempts of the German groups to obtain special privileges from Rome in 1886, and the unsuccessful attempts to secure German national bishoprics in 1890 and 1891; the successful intervention of Gibbons to block papal condemnation of the Knights of Labor in 1887; the attempt to have Ireland's Faribault school agreement in Minnesota approved in 1892 with its attendant parochial school controversy from 1890 to 1895; the participation of Gibbons, Ireland, and Keane in the Parliament of Religions in Chicago in 1893 followed by the papal prohibition of such congresses in 1895; and the enforced resignation of Keane from the rectorship of the Catholic University of America in 1896. This controversy in the United States, which was chiefly over Americanization, not Americanism, crossed to Rome and became entangled in the European controversy over Americanism when the progressive leaders tried to prevent the papal condemnation of the European Americanism. The progressives were naturally sensitive to the implications of such papal action against their own position and against all American Catholicism.

While the progressive bishops in America were fostering political and social Americanism among the newly-arrived Catholic immigrants, liberal Catholic groups in France, Germany, and Italy began to praise a religious Americanism as the cause of the progress of the Church in America. These liberals were, in general, poorly informed about life among Catholics in the United States. They used chiefly the reports of European travelers[16] and the numerical growth of the Catholic body in the United States to emphasize certain things in American Catholicism which they desired to see adopted in Europe. The chief desideratum in France, of course, was greater co-operation with the republic, and in other countries the so-called Americanists sought other changes in church policy. Thus, in the height of the controversy, European Americanism had at least four different meanings.[17] In Italy, Americanism was concerned with the

[16] Cf. "Le Catholicisme aux Etats Unis" by M. Ferdinand Brunetière in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, CL (Nov. 1, 1895), 140-181.

[17] *New York Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register*, December 3, 1898; cf. Houtin, *op. cit.*, pp. 287-289.

separation of Church and State and the elimination of the temporal power of the Holy See; in Germany, Americanism was associated with the modernists who sought a radical reformation in doctrine, particularly concerning the Church's attitude toward the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures; and in France, Americanism included two distinct groups, the one favoring greater co-operation with the republican government, and the other tending towards heretical modernism.

The French Americanists were the most influential in Europe and at Rome, and most of the theological controversy was carried on in French journals until the matter was carried to Rome and there attracted the attention of Roman editors. The second and less numerous group of the French Americanists had found in the unlearned theological conduct of some American clergymen, and especially in the Parliament of Religions of 1893, a cover for their own heretical modernism. They were not sincere admirers of the Church in the United States; they found their chief attraction in American Catholicism in the Parliament of Religions which they hoped to repeat in Paris in 1900. Their leading exponent was the Abbé Victor Charbonnel.[18] Because he called himself an "Americanist" in his writings before and after he left the Church, he caused a suspicion of modernism to be attached to the whole French Americanist movement, even though the other group of French Americanists disowned him, especially after the papal action against such gatherings as the Parliament of Religions.

The other group of French Americanists were chiefly those who favored greater ecclesiastical co-operation with the republic. They had found new strength in Leo XIII's letter to the French bishops of February 16, 1892, *Au milieu des sollicitudes*, which supported their stand. They also derived great encouragement from the appearance among them in 1892 of Archbishop Ireland—some thought with a direct charge from Leo XIII. Speaking in the Hall of the Society of Geography in Paris in June, 1892, Ireland advocated greater co-operation with the spirit of the age, and he praised the growth of the Church in the United States and the harmony which existed between Church and State in this country. Before his departure popular demand forced Ireland to speak again and also prompted Abbé Felix Klein, youthful professor of the Institut

[18] Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, pp. 562-568.

Catholique of Paris, to publish a collection of Ireland's speeches, which were later published in America in the two volumes entitled *The Church and Modern Society*.[19] This liberal Catholic group continued its praise of the progress of the Church in the United States, using that progress as an argument for their own party in France. Further, until the Pope sent his letter disapproving of a repetition of the Parliament of Religions, these same groups favored a similar congress at the Paris Exposition in 1900, especially after Bishop Keane had praised the Chicago gathering at the International Catholic Scientific Congress at Brussels in 1894.[20] There was some answering criticism and the usual attempt to make these liberals guilty of the false liberalism condemned in France earlier in the century. Americanism, however, did not become the center of the controversy until the appearance of the French translation of the biography of Father Isaac T. Hecker.

Early in 1897, Abbé Klein received from Count de Chabrol a translation of the *Life of Father Hecker*,[21] written by Father Walter Elliott of the Paulists with an introduction by Archbishop Ireland. Klein adapted and touched up the translation and wrote for it an enthusiastic preface in which he praised Hecker as the type of the "modern" priest[22] and emphasized those passages of the biography and certain quotations from Hecker's personal journal which he felt made Hecker a forerunner of the type of priest needed in the modern world. Using those passages as a guide, Klein praised Hecker for saying that, because of the personal independence necessarily introduced by modern material conditions, the individual man must be his own spiritual guide and for insisting that the direct action by God upon individual souls could be expected in these changed conditions. He also lauded Hecker for teaching that the Church had reached a new period when the Saxon races were pre-

[19] (Chicago, 1903.)

[20] Supporting the Americanists in France, were articles in *La Vie Catholique*, *Le Correspondant*, *L'Univers*, *La Revue des Deux Mondes* (M. Brunetière), *La Quinzaine*, *La Justice Sociale*, and *Le Courrier de Genève*. Opposing were chiefly *La Vérité Française* (Abbés Peries as "Clement" and Magnien as "Martel"), *La Croix*, and *L'Autorité*.

[21] Published in New York in 1891.

[22] The title page of the translation reads as follows: *Le Père Hecker Fondateur des "Paulistes" Américains 1819-1888*, par Le Père W. Elliott de la même Compagnie. Traduit et adapté de l'Anglais avec autorisation de l'auteur. Introduction par Mgr. Ireland. Préface par l'Abbé Félix Klein. (Paris, 1897), Klein's preface fills pages i-xxxv.

dominating over the Latins and when a new spirituality was developing in which not the passive but the active virtues were to be cultivated and in which greater opportunity would be offered for the immediate guidance of the individual soul by the Holy Spirit.

In a few months the Klein book ran through seven French editions and the liberal French press was filled with enthusiastic reviews and praises of Hecker and of his doctrines, as expounded by Klein, which were frequently lumped together as Americanism.[23] Then came the reaction among the conservative and anti-republican, groups who found the democratic implications of the new doctrines distasteful and who quickly found theological defects in the enthusiastic writings of the Abbé Klein.

In America the progressive prelates, particularly Ireland, Keane, and Gibbons, were also admirers of Hecker but they did not share all the enthusiasms of the European Americanists. At the International Catholic Scientific Congress of Fribourg in August, 1897,[24] Monsignor Denis O'Connell attempted to clear the name of Hecker and the American prelates from the extreme counter-charges of their critics, but he was, in turn, bitterly attacked by Bishop Turinaz of Nancy. The bombshell that really touched off the bitter part of the controversy was a series of articles in *La Vérité Française* of Paris in 1898 attacking both Father Hecker and the doctrine of Americanism. The articles were written by Abbé Charles Maignen of the Congregation of the Brothers of St. Vincent De Paul, under the pseudonym of Martel, and Abbé Georges Peries, a discharged canon law professor from the Catholic University of America, under the name of Clement. Many of these articles were reprinted by Maignen in book form under the title *Études sur l 'Américanisme, le Père Hecker: est-il un saint?*[25]

Refused an *imprimatur* by Cardinal Richard of Paris, the book received one from the Dominican, Albert Lepidi, Master of the Sacred Palace in Rome. The charges against the Americanists in this series of essays were based only in part on the biography of Hecker. The doctrines Maignen attacked were drawn chiefly from

[23] *Compte rendu du quatrième Congrès scientifique international des Catholiques tenu à Fribourg (Suisse) du 16 au 20 août 1897.* Quatrième Section-Sciences Juridiques, Économiques et Sociales. (Fribourg, Suisse, 1898), pp. 74-81. For the attack of Mgr. Turinas cf. *ibid.*, pp. 34-36.

[24] Denis J. O'Connell, *A New Idea in the Life of Father Hecker,* (Fribourg, 1897)

[25] (Rome et Paris, 1898); translated into English as *Studies in Americanism—Father Hecker, Is he a Saint?* (Rome, 1898).

the interpretations of Hecker and Americanism contained in Klein's preface, from Klein's articles in *La Revue Français de Edimbourg*, from a few passages from Ireland's writings and Keane's and O'Connell's speeches, and from the writings of Charbonnel, with only selected passages from the biography. These selected passages from the French life of Hecker, as placed in the new context, pictured the founder of the Paulists as holding doctrines concerning spiritual direction and apologetics foreign to the Paulist's own statements. Thus, in their new apologetical approach, the Americanists were accused of limiting the external submission to the Church, of advocating a false liberalism in their dealings with non-Catholics, of advocating a complete separation of Church and State, of opposition to the evangelical virtues and the older religious orders, and of advocating the practice of active virtues over the passive virtues and the natural virtues over the supernatural.

The liberal press continued to praise Hecker and the Americanists while the conservatives joined *La Vérité* in condemnation. Father A. J. Delattre, S.J.,[26] published in Belgium his *Un Catholicisme Américain* which attacked particularly the asceticism of Hecker as interpreted by Klein and defended the older religious orders against the Americanists. Father Hyppolite Martin, S.J., wrote an article, "L'Américanisme," of similar character for *Études Religeuses*.[27] The discussion quickly passed over the Alps to Rome and had its echoes even in America where Cardinal Gibbons and his friends became alarmed at the unfriendly attitude towards American Catholicism which was developing in Rome.

An English translation of Maignen's book was at first rejected by American publishers, but later copies were accepted for sale by Arthur Preuss, the bitter critic of the Americanizing bishops and editor of *The Review* of St. Louis, which quoted long passages from Maignen in its columns. Aroused by the bitterness of this attack, Cardinal Gibbons, on August 27, 1898, sent a lengthy letter[28] of protest to Cardinal Rampolla, the papal Secretary of State, against Maignen's book and especially against the granting of the *imprimatur* by the Master of the Sacred Palace. The controversy in European periodicals grew more intense and the Pope appointed a

[26] A. J. Delattre, S.J., *Un Catholicisme Américain*, (Namur, 1898).

[27] "L'Américanisme," in *Études Religieuses*, LXXVI (July 20, 1898), 214-224, translated in *The Review* of Arthur Preuss, September 1, 1898.

[28] Copy in the Baltimore Cathedral Archives, 96-M-6.

commission of cardinals headed by Cardinals Mazzella and Satolli to study the question. Another pamphlet,[29] with the *imprimatur* of Lepidi, defending Lepidi's right to give an *imprimatur* to Maignen and repeating most of the charges of Maignen's book, appeared in Italian later in the summer of 1898 and gave evidence of the forthcoming decision of the commission of cardinals.

The report of the cardinals was a strong condemnation of "Americanism." However, Leo XIII took the matter under advisement and rewrote with softer language the beginning and the end of the document. Informed of the approaching decision, Archbishop Ireland hastened to Rome, but he arrived too late to stop the letter. Gibbons also learned of the threatened letter and telegraphed to Rampolla, asking that the letter be withheld. The papal Secretary of State replied on February 9, 1899,[30] that he had shown the telegram to the Pope but that it had come too late since copies of the apostolic letter had already been sent to other American bishops. Further, Rampolla said that Leo XIII could no longer delay his decision because of the threatened division of the Church in France over the question. The cardinal added, however, that Gibbons would be satisfied when he read the letter. Evidently he felt that the letter, toned down by the Pope's milder language, did not really accuse the American bishops of holding the condemned doctrines.

Pope Leo XIII did soften the document prepared for him by the cardinals and he did not actually say that the doctrines he condemned were held in America. He did state that this letter was not one of praise but was intended to suppress certain contentions which had arisen among the faithful of the country. Turning then to the purpose of the apostolic letter, Pope Leo indicated that he wished to discuss certain doctrines concerning the way of leading a Christian life which had been brought forward in connection with the biography of Father Hecker, especially through the interpretation and translation of the volume in a foreign language. The underlying principle of these false doctrines, he insisted, was that in this new age the Church should relax her ancient severity and make concessions to new opinions in order to make easier the approach of converts to the Church. The Holy Father pointed out that this principle was being supported by the false theory that, since the

[29] *L'Americanismo ovvero Riposta ad un articolo dell' "Opinione Liberale" (N. 171-25 Guigno 1898) sul P. Hecker*, (Roma, 1898).

[30] Baltimore Cathedral Archives, 97-D-1R.

declaration of papal infallibility provided security from error, greater liberty should be allowed the faithful in matters of doctrine and practice.

From this general principle, the Pope continued, those who held this more general error had drawn from it certain faulty conclusions which must be condemned. First, the Americanists held that external guidance should be set aside for souls striving for Christian perfection since the Holy Spirit gives His grace in greater abundance without human intervention in the new age; second, they gave an unwarranted importance to the natural virtues, as corresponding better to the needs of the times; third, they divided virtues into active and passive and maintained that the vows of religious life were alien to the spirit of modern times; fifth, they argued that a new method must be developed for winning back to the Church those who had fallen away. While rejecting these five doctrines, the Holy Father concluded his letter with an assurance that he did not in any way condemn the political conditions, laws, or customs by which Americans were governed.

In France Abbé Klein and the sincere French Americanists quickly submitted. The French life of Hecker was withdrawn and theological Americanism was dead. Those who had attacked the Americanists praised the Pope's letter and were irritated at the statement of Archbishop Ireland that he had never held the condemned doctrines. Others such as George Fonsgrieve in *La Quinzaine*[31] supported the opinions of Ireland. When the French monarchists attempted to exploit the papal letter as a condemnation of the French republicans, the Pope reiterated his earlier support of democratic trends in France in a letter dated May 25, 1899,[32] to Archbishop Servonnet of Bourges. Nevertheless, the *Civiltà Cattolica*[33] charged those who denied the existence of the heresy in the United States with using a Jansenistic mental reservation.

The controversy in the United States did not cease with the papal letter. Archbishop Corrigan[34] publicly thanked the Pope for saving

[31] "Américanisme et Américains," in *La Quinzaine*, April 1, 1899, pp. 306-318. The attack of certain French bishops on this article and his subsequent reception by Pope Leo XIII are recounted by Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, pp. 593-596.

[32] Lecanuet, *op. cit.*, pp. 596-597.

[33] *Civiltà Cattolica*, V (1899), Series XVI, 541-543.

[34] These letters appeared first in the Roman press and were usually copied by American periodicals of the day. Archbishop Corrigan's letter is given in the *Tablet*, 93 (May 20, 1899), 779-780, Archbishop Ireland's, *Ibid.*, 93 (March 4, 1899), 352.

the American faithful from the threatened error. Most of the American bishops accepted the papal letter and affirmed their rejection of the condemned doctrines. Archbishop Ireland, before leaving Rome, thanked the Pope for his letter but asserted that he had never at any time held the condemned doctrines. In a spirit of pique at this denial the bishops of the Province of Milwaukee, not only accepted the existence of the heresy but, following the lead of the *Civiltà Cattolica*, told the Holy Father they could not help expressing their "pain and just indignation"[35] that some "did not hesitate to proclaim again and again, in Jansenistic fashion, that there was hardly an American who held the condemned errors." Finally, on March 17, 1899, Cardinal Gibbons, in a letter[36] that was not made public at the time, told the Pope that no American bishop, priest, or layman properly instructed in his religion held the doctrines condemned by the papal letter.

The final chapter of the American controversy is contained in the Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Archbishops held on October 12, 1899, in Baltimore. It is to be noted that the Archbishop of Milwaukee was not present at the meeting. The minutes read as follows:

> Then Archbishop Riordan, having called attention to the letter of our Holy Father, *Testem Benevolentiae*, which we all accept with gratitude, referred to the letter of the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Milwaukee, in which the existence in this country of the condemned errors was admitted, and in such manner that those who deny their existence are now branded as Jansenists. This he considered of grave importance, being a direct charge of heresy against some of ourselves.
>
> Archbishop Kain spoke on the same lines and expressed his opinion that some action should be taken by us in protest against the charge implied in that letter.
>
> Archbishop Ireland followed and, tracing the development of erroneous teaching in the Church of America and deprecating the letter of the Milwaukee prelates, he moved that the Most Rev. Secretary be instructed to write to all the Bishops of America and ask from them an expression of their opinion of these two questions:
>
> First —Whether these errors do exist in their Diocese or in other parts of America, and
>
> Second—If they do, then to specify *where* they exist and by *whom* they are held.

---

[35] Reprinted in *The Review*, July 27, 1899. The letter is dated: "Milwaukee, Pentecost Sunday, 1899."

[36] Published in the *Catholic Historical Review*, XXX (October, 1944), 346-348.

The Archbishop of New York strongly deprecated the adoption of the above resolution, because he thought it would be disrespectful to the Holy Father.

Archbishop Ryan also objected to the resolution, and offered the following substitute.

That the Prelates here do all they can to induce all the Bishops who have not written to the Holy Father, in response to his letter to Cardinal Gibbons, to write to him.

The substitute was lost by a tie vote.

The original resolution was then put and defeated by a vote of four ayes to five nays—His Eminence casting his vote against it.[37]

These minutes mark the close of the official controversy but they do not give the answer to the persistent question about the factual basis for the condemned doctrines in American Catholicism. Certainly these minutes and the public expression of the American bishops show that none had any desire to defend the condemned doctrines. There was in the utterances of all the American prelates a general tone of regret that the term Americanism had been associated with any heretical doctrines. It was also quite evident that much of the feeling in the debate, as well as the division of the prelates over the question, followed closely the lines of cleavage in the other American controversies of the bishops in the preceeding decade. Thus, to the progressive prelates the condemned Americanism existed only in the minds of certain European writers while to their opponents the condemned doctrine constituted a real heresy that was creeping into American religious institutions.

To say that the political and personal prejudices arising out of the opposition to Americanization were the only American reality does not do justice to the ability and zeal of the American Catholic hierarchy and press of that day. Since it is no longer necessary to take sides in the discussion, the historian, with a perspective of nearly fifty years, can see that American Catholicism of the 1890's did really have distinctive characteristics—the third kind of Americanism,[38] quite distinct from the political and social Americanism and from the theological opinions formulated in Europe. This Americanism, or Americanisms, which European religious writers rationalized into their heretical opinions can be considered as the effects

[37] Printed minutes, Baltimore Cathedral Archives, 97-R-5.

[38] The question of the tendencies, which formed the occasion of French Americanism, and which were used by critics to support their charges that the heresy existed in America, the writer has discussed at some length in his article in the *Review of Politics* referred to in note 1.

of new world conditions or—without too closely defining the term —of the American frontier on Roman Catholicism. These peculiarities of American Catholicism really existed and have a striking resemblance to the doctrines condemned by the apostolic letter.

One has only to read the criticism of American Catholic conditions in the literature of the Cahensley controversy to realize there were many deficiencies in Catholicism in the United States. Arthur Preuss in *The Review*, William Faerber and Innocent Wapelhorst, O.F.M., in the *Pastoral Blatt*, and Jules Tardivel, editor of *La Vérité* of Quebec, were constantly pointing out the moral defects of American social and political conditions and the public opposition in the United States[39] to Catholicism. The growth of divorce, the decline in denominational church membership, the A.P.A. movement, and government interference in the Catholic Indian missions were stock arguments proving the evils of a hasty Americanization of the Church. In addition to these conditons, which were really beyond church control, the historian, using the points of the papal letter as a guide, can easily note certain tendencies in American Catholicism of the 1890's which were wrongly rationalized by European observers into the heresies of Americanism. These tendencies are mostly indifferent in themselves, being for the most part unconscious developments brought about by such new world conditions as frontier primitiveness, the large scale exploitation of vast national resources, and the progress of American industrialism.

In exploring these tendencies noticeable in American Catholicism, however, the historian must observe that they were entirely unrehearsed and unplanned and consisted mostly of unconnected incidents which can be grouped into tendencies only from the perspective of history. Above all, it is quite clear that while Isaac T. Hecker and his admirers Ireland, Gibbons, Keane, and O'Connell praised American conditions and saw a happy future for Catholicism in American political freedom, the freedom they lauded was never freedom from ecclesiastical authority or religious dogmas. And it is significant today that Old World Catholicism is learning, after bitter experience, that Hecker and his friends were the real prophets in picturing the brighter future of the Church in the democratic United

[39] Examples of this criticism may be found in *The Review*, V (1898), *passim*, especially the issues of November 3, and December 28, 1898. For Faerber and Wapelhorst *supra*, n. 11. For Tardivel and the French-Canadian criticisms see his *La situation religieuse aux États-Unis*, (Montreal, 1900).

States.[40] But in the 1890's these peculiar tendencies of American Catholicism had the usual frontier qualities of rugged energy, contempt for red tape, and a definite lack of culture and refinement. Catholicism as well as all institutions in America, had come under the impact of American frontier conditions. American Protestantism[41] had undergone many changes in the new situations. Roman Catholicism,, safeguarded by its authoritarian organization, was affected only by its material circumstances.

In general, American Catholics did feel and still feel that, with its mechanization and its marvels of science, the modern world has called for modifications in religious living. But the security of American Catholics in facing such charges has been based not so much on the declaration of papal infallibility as upon the constant tradition in American Catholicism of loyalty to and trust in the Holy Father. In addition to this loyalty there was a noticeable lack of theological learning in nineteenth-century America, which necessarily deepened this trust in the Church's infallibility while causing an apparent carelessness in the use of theological definitions. The lack of sufficient clergy to care for the expanding frontier and the obligation to care for thousands of needy immigrants allowed little time for theological discussion and forced the bishops to place greater emphasis on the practical problems of increasing missions and the need of church and school buildings. Generally speaking, the abandonment of some old world Catholic practices under these conditions was merely an attempt to concentrate on the essential Catholic doctrines and practices in new situations, leaving to another day the development of accidental devotions.

The accidental modifications of Catholicism in the United States included more than the problems discussed in the apostolic letter, but the concentration of the European controversy and the Pope's letter on these particular tendencies make them good, and probably the most important, examples of the effect of the new world upon

[40] Although Hecker's volume, *The Church and the Age* (New York, 1887), contains phraseology that could be misinterpreted by critics, no one can question his appreciation of the problem of keeping the American Catholic layman faithful to his religious obligations.

[41] On the effect of new world conditions on American Protestantism cf. William W. Sweet, *The Story of Religions in America*, (New York, 1930), pp. 298-379, P. G. Mode, *The Frontier Spirit in American Christianity*, (New York, 1923), pp. 11-12; 146-164, and Kenneth Scott Latourette, *The Great Century A. D., 1800-1914*, (New York, 1941), pp. 175-223.

the age old doctrines and practices of the Church. At least no one can deny that the doctrines of the condemned Americanism had their counterparts in tendencies among the Catholics of the day. Isaac Hecker and the other American clergy who were trying to solve the problem of the Catholic minority scattered in work shops and on American farmlands, had no notion of substituting the private inspiration of Protestantism for the external guidance of the Church but they did feel that a greater attention to interior grace must be substituted where the external guidance could not be had. It must be remembered that this controversy took place before the present era of frequent Communion and the ordinary American Catholic was thrown into circumstances and among companions that were at least non-Catholic if not opposed to the Church. The progressive clergymen were merely trying to make the best of a bad situation. Catholic Action today has the same problem and has to overcome the same obstacles and fear the same mistakes, and the *Testem Benevolentiae* offers some guiding principles for directors in this uncharted sea.

The charge that Americans give unwarranted importance to natural virtues has been a common accusation—usually in the form that Americans think too much of the "almighty dollar." But in the frontier, and even in the older sections of the United States, in the 1890's the possibilities of natural conquest seemed almost unlimited and to expect Catholics to pass by these opportunities was unreasonable. No real Catholics ever actually preferred the natural virtues to the supernatural, but the drive and industry of the pioneer American was necessary to survive and progress. John L. Spalding caught this notion when he said, "Only what is evil is profane."[42] The distinction between active and passive virtues was a false one if taken literally but no one has clearly determined what Hecker meant by these terms. Used loosely the active virtues were the aggressive attitudes towards modern religious problems of those progressive Catholic clergymen and laymen who wanted to go out and convert America and at the same time sought to have Catholics in the van of every worthwhile movement. Most immigrant Catholics, especially the Irish, were unwilling to be a passive minority in growing America. It can be granted that Americans of the nineteenth century placed too much faith in doing rather than thinking

[42] J. L. Spalding, *Religion, Agnosticism and Education*, (Chicago, 1902), p. 12.

and American Catholics must have been affected by the spirit of the times despite themselves. This love of action is a common error of young persons and of the people of a young nation.

On the question of religious vows, there has always been bickering between secular and regular clergy,[43] but considering the great work done in the United States by religious communities it would be strange if American Catholics really opposed the taking of vows. Yet, the historian familiar with the actual problems of American religious communities trying to care for the expanding Catholic body, particularly in the West,[44] knows that the superiors of religious communities sometimes shortened the time of preparation and broke down religious discipline to send out missionaries to neglected stations; and those superiors of religious communities residing in cities did not find urban living helpful to monastic life. Hecker had no real disregard for vows but he simply felt that his organization could function better without them. The rationalization of this idea to a disregard for religious vows may have had a few followers in America but generally the actuality was a sense of the pressing need for a freely-moving clergy to reach a scattered and mobile Catholic population.

As to the insistence upon a new method of winning converts, the minimizing charged to the American clergy had some basis in fact. Most American Protestants did not know the tenets of their own faith and had little of the theological hostility towards the Church that their ancestors had harbored in Europe. It seemed logical in the freer conditions of America to meet such persons halfway in joint religious sessions and in mutual exchanges of civilities. Undoubtedly, several Catholic clergymen violated the Church discipline about associating with ministers of other faiths and in regard to secret fraternal organizations, but it was done in the spirit of New World friendliness and freedom. The American neglect of liturgical and devotional practices was not a planned departure but was an accommodation to pioneer situations which had its counterpart in the meager furnishings and procedure of the frontier courtroom and public assembly. There was also a certain amount of ignorance. The

[43] Father George Zurcher, a temperance advocate of Buffalo, published a pamphlet, *Monks and Their Decline*, (1898), which was placed on the Index of Prohibited Books on September 1, 1898.

[44] *Cf.* Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J., *The Jesuits of the Middle United States* (New York, 1938), I, 543-546.

Pope objected to this neglect, and he urged the greater use of the Church's devotions and practices to attract converts. Recent decades with their liturgical and catechetical activities have shown the Pope's plan to be a better and more successful apologetic for those approaching the Church. Here as in the other tendencies, the apostolic letter undoubtedly did a great service to American Catholicism.

In applying the *Testem Benevolentiae* to the American situation the historian finds a conclusion to the controversy which the bitterness of an earlier day prevented. By admitting the existence of tendencies in America he need not condemn or praise them, but he can show that Leo XIII and the contending American clergy of the 1890's were not chasing shadows. They were dealing zealously with realities which, however, had been misconstrued in the theological battles of Europe. The episode is one of the most interesting in all American Catholic history and the leaders in the controversy are our most attractive and most beloved clergymen. The subject matter of the controversy is by no means dead, although the animosity aroused in the heat of controversy has given way to a more unified zeal to solve the continuing problems of American Catholicism. But the application of the *Testem Benevolentiae* to present-day America is not a historical problem and can be left to contemporary theologians.

THOMAS T. MCAVOY

University of Notre Dame

A MYTH IN *"L'AMÉRICANISME"**

ON December 22, 1888, Isaac Thomas Hecker died in New York City. He had had a full and active life as a missionary, as an editor, and as an apologist. He had projected his ideals and his hopes in the religious society which he had founded—the Paulist Fathers. Throughout a goodly portion of the United States he was well known both to laity and to clergy through his writings and his preaching. Shortly after Father Hecker's death, his devoted disciple, Father Walter Elliott, prepared the biography of this illustrious convert. The volume was carefully examined by Father Augustine Hewitt, a capable theologian, who had been appointed *censor deputatus*, and it was published with the permission of Archbishop Corrigan of New York.

The *Life* met with considerable success and it went through several editions. It was not, however, without some faults. Elliott had prepared the work in the midst of parochial duties as well as journalistic labors, for during the time he wrote the volume he was an associate editor of the *Catholic World*. Naturally, he had little time for exhaustive research or even for a searching examination of available material. That he fell into many inaccuracies of fact, is obvious from a comparison of the *Life of Father Hecker*[1] and *The Early Years of Isaac Thomas Hecker*.[2] In addition, Walter Elliott intended, as he wrote: "to tell the achievements and chronicle the virtues of Father Hecker."[3] Consequently it happened that he did not present a balanced biography of the man he reverenced. Archbishop Keane, who personally knew Hecker, once remarked after reading the *Life*: "That is Elliott's Hecker, not Hecker's Hecker."[4] These facts are mentioned, not to discredit Elliott, but merely to call

* An abbreviated version of this article was read as a paper at the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Chicago, December 28, 1944.

[1] (New York, 1891).

[2] Vincent F. Holden, C.S.P., *Early Years of Isaac Thomas Hecker (1819-1844)* (Washington, 1939).

[3] *Life of Father Hecker* (New York, 1891), p. iii.

[4] A similar reaction is noted by Ellen H. Walworth in *Life Sketches of Father Walworth* (Albany, 1907). "Father Walworth's most frequent comment as he listened month after month to the many extracts from his old friend's journal was: 'That's Hecker's Hecker!' Now and then as the reading of the text proceeded, he said emphatically: 'That's Elliott's Hecker!' " p. 155.

due attention to the biographer's personal interpretations and to his arbitrary selection of material, facts which could easily and actually did give rise to serious misinterpretations of Father Hecker's views. As "Innominato," writing in the New York *Sun*, July 31, 1898, said: "If Father Elliott had been a vigorous and trained theologian he would have set the personal theories of the former Hegelian Protestant in a clear light." Of course, Elliott's intent was not to present a synthesis of Hecker's theology, but rather a pen-picture of his virtues and achievements.

In 1891, particularly after the publication of the Elliott biography, Father Hecker was fairly well known in the United States but he was not too well known in Europe. He had made several trips to the continent, had met influential people, exchanged ideas with them, was highly regarded by those who had formed his acquaintance, but he was not a public figure. Six years later, the situation had changed completely. His name was not only known, but his ideas were discussed and argued under the term "Heckerism." What brought about the change from practical obscurity to questionable prominence? The underlying cause is to be found in the chain of events which was forged in Europe at that time. The struggle had broken out between established but disintegrating monarchism and new and struggling republicanism. The impact of these two ideologies had been felt throughout Europe and it seemed to resound particularly in France. To discuss in detail the course of this struggle, even in France, would be alien to our purpose here. Attention is called to its existence simply because it was the basic fact which provided the occasion for the attack on so-called Americanism.

The starting point is fixed by those measures which Leo XIII took as a means of reconciling the Church with the French Republic, the policy known as the *Ralliement*. Almost immediately, the ultra-conservatives were alarmed. When he issued his celebrated letter to the Church in France, February, 1892, the monarchists regarded it as a powerful plea for the Republic. Then the cleavage between the two camps became clear and definite. Inevitably, the press warfare started. *Univers*, previously supporting in a rather mild way the cause of legitimism, changed its tone and acknowledged the republic. To offset this influence a new journal was started, *La Vérité*, under the editorship of Auguste Roussel. The cause of the Republic and its possible effect on religion was alternately supported and attacked by various periodicals and groups.

Into this turbulent scene stepped Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul. On his way through Paris after an *ad limina* visit to Rome, he was requested to deliver a lecture explaining why the Church flourished so marvelously in America and what was the secret of its success. In an eloquent address, delivered in the hall of the Geographical Society in Paris on June 18, 1892, he explained the American form of government, the relationship between the Church and State, and the "Church's happy self-government under a constitution which made Caesarism impossible."[5] The conflagration had ignited. Into it was thrown a deluge of pamphlets and articles. Still the cause was not complete—at least, not for the republicans. They needed a standard-bearer, a man who had lived a holy life and had put into practice principles they so loftily enunciated. In this way they would sanctify their cause. They selected for their standard-bearer, Isaac Hecker,[6] whose teachings had been publically proclaimed by his champions, John Ireland, John J. Keane, and Denis J. O'Connell. His life, written by Walter Elliott, was translated into French by a cousin of the Count de Chabrol, the Countess de Revilliasc.[7] When the translation was finished, the count tried for almost a year to secure a publisher, but with no success. The publishing houses of Plon, Pousseielque, and Lecoffre rejected the manuscript with the observations:

> This work, as it is now, will not sell in France; it is too long and about a subject too specially connected with America to find its way to the public at large. Besides, the way in which it is written, in spite of the very real talent of the author, is very different from the

---

[5] William Barry, " 'Americanism' True and False" *North American Review*, CLXIX (July, 1899), 36.

[6] Cf: Guilio Vitali, "Father Hecker's Moral Legacy," in *Rassegna Nazionale*, CIV (December, 1898). "The French Americanists had, for purposes of their own, altered the colors,—suppressed some traits, exaggerated others—of the figure of their hero." Vitali, before publishing his article had read the English *Life* and Hecker's *Aspirations of Nature* (New York, 1857), *Questions of the Soul*, (New York, 1868), and *The Church and the Age*, (New York, 1887).

A similar opinion was expressed by A. de La Barre "Le Père Hecker," in *Études*, LXXXII (Sept. 20, 1897), 808.

[7] This translation has been erroneously ascribed to Abbé Felix Klein. The Count de Chabrol writing to Elliott, May 21, 1897, spoke of the countess as "la modeste et habile traductrice," and again on July 13, 1897, "la patiente et humble traductrice de votre livre." Paulist Fathers' Archives, New York City, Americanism Papers. Hereafter these archives will be referred to as: PFA.

> usual plan of our biographies. The French reader will get lost in many details which are familiar to the American reader, but which, on this side of the ocean, will be little and poorly understood. To attract our public, even our religious public, it would be necessary to abbreviate the work a lot, to remelt it, so to speak, in order that one may follow the different phases of Father Hecker's life in a more chronological and less synthetic manner.[8]

As a result of these and similar observations by other publishers, the countess, on the advice of her cousin, submitted the following proposal to Elliott: "Either obtain from you the authorization not only to abbreviate the work but to present it on a new plan (while keeping religiously to your ideas, Father, and to the quotations from Father Hecker) or, if you do not think you can agree to this, return to you the full liberty to entrust the translation to some other person who might be more fortunate from the standpoint of publication."[9] Elliott immediately accepted the first proposal and the adaptation as well as the translation was prepared.

To advertise it to the French public, a popular and compelling name was also needed, so the Abbé Felix Klein was asked to write the preface.[10] He gladly acquiesced and prepared a very glowing tribute in which, as the London *Tablet* of March 18, 1899, remarked, "He rather out-Heckers Hecker precisely in those points on which it were possible for a critic bent on fault-finding to attach to his words a meaning of doubtful orthodoxy."

What was offered to the French public, then, was not a critical or accurate study of Hecker and his views, but rather a reconstructed and inaccurate translation of a volume detailing the achievements and virtues of the founder of the Paulists.[11] Despite these shortcomings, the French *Life* was an immediate success. It went through seven editions in a short time. Archbishop Keane jubilantly wrote to Father Elliott on December 13, 1897: "It is read with avidity by all the young men and all the thinking men among the French clergy

[8] Count de Chabrol to Elliott, July 21, 1893, PFA, Americanism Papers.

[9] *Ibid.*, Countess de Revilliasc, June 11, 1894.

[10] *Ibid.*, Count de Chabrol to Elliott, June 15, 1896.

[11] P. Coppinger, *La Polémique Française sur la vie du Père Hecker* (Paris, 1898), shows conclusively how much the translation departed from the original. So, too, does William Barry, "The French Life of Father Hecker," *Catholic Times and Catholic Opinion of Liverpool*, December 9, 1898.

and is acting like a leaven among them."[12] So great was the success that plans were made for a translation into Italian.

During this time, the monarchist opposition—the irreconcilables, as Barry called them—was not silent.[13] A series of articles appeared in *La Vérité* attacking Hecker and the views imputed to him in the French *Life*. They were signed "Martel" and "St. Clement." Martel was the pen name of Charles Maignen, a priest of the Congregation of the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul. This was not his first attack against the republicans. He had made himself notorious with his unrestrained attacks on the Count de Mun, the illustrious leader of the French Catholic laity. So insulting and unrelenting was his method that his bishop removed him from his chaplaincy. "St. Clement" was the *nom-de-plume* of G. Peries who had been dismissed as professor of canon law from the Catholic University of America in Washington.[14] These articles were later collected and amplified into a volume by Maignen entitled *Le Père Hecker—Est-il-Un Saint?* There is no point in discussing this volume. It is known and acknowledged to be inaccurate, biased, vitriolic, libelous, and venomous.[15] It drew solely for its authority on the French translation and it made no appeal to any of Hecker's printed writings.[16] It spread rapidly and went through several editions.

Another pamphlet was issued in Italian as a reply to an article in *L'Opinione Liberale* on Father Hecker. Although it did not have such a popular effect, it had considerably more influence because it

[12] PFA, Americanism Papers.

[13] Hecker was attacked in sermons given in Paris churches until the Archbishop of Paris issued word that no mention of the controversy was to be heard from the pulpits. Klein to Elliott, December 3, 1897, PFA. E. Trogan in *La Revue Générale* of Brussels, I (January, 1898), wrote of some of these attacks.

[14] Keane to Elliott, April 19, 1898, PFA, Americanism Papers; Baltimore *Sun*, January 20, 1898.

[15] Cardinal Gibbons in a letter to Cardinal Rampolla of August 27, 1898, said that in this book "la plus complete mauvaise foi s'unit à la haine plus violante," Baltimore Cathedral Archives, 96-M-6. For further opinions on this volume, cf. P. Coppinger, *op. cit.;* London *Tablet*, March 18, 1899; William Barry "An American Crusade," in *National Review*, XXXIII (March, 1899); W. L. S., "Some Causes and Lessons of the French Crisis" in *Catholic World*, LXXX (March, 1905), 733-744.

[16] Although Maignen quoted passages from Hecker's work, these were all taken from *La Vie du P. Hecker* (Paris, 1897).

was written by a cardinal.[17] Evidently, the author was not at all familiar with the facts of Hecker's life. He presented an unhistorical and inaccurate view of the separation of Hecker from the Redemptorists, misinterpreted Hecker's ideas on reaching the non-Catholic, totally misunderstood his ideas on the Holy Spirit, and accused him of coming close to a new conception of Catholicism itself.[18]

The interesting fact about these two works and other published material of the monarchists is that the only source for their knowledge of Hecker and his ideas was the French *Life*. They did not appear to be familiar with anything that Hecker himself wrote. They appealed entirely to the selections of his work that Elliott's translator used and the various interpretations put upon Hecker's words by his protagonists. In view of these facts, the writer does not intend to defend any conclusions drawn from Hecker's words by others and later pounced upon by the irreconcilables. Nor does he propose to enter upon any quotation versus quotation refutation of the charges that have been made against him. In the interest of historical truth and accuracy, it is only fair and just to point out that the ideas ascribed to Hecker were actually not his at all but rather misinterpretations fastened to his name.

First in order is the "new apologetic." Maignen summed up Hecker's approach to the non-Catholic in these words: "His theory, as here formulated and as reproduced in a number of passages throughout his writings, is that the Church is 'closed' and that to draw dissidents within her boundaries it is not enough to bring them to her—the barriers must be thrown down, the doors widened; everything in short must be suppressed which could impede the advance" of non-Catholics into the Church.[19] This was a complete distortion of Hecker's approach. He never at any time believed in minimizing doctrine, nor suppressing truth. In fact, he definitely deplored such action. When writing of the return of the Saxon

[17] S. Brandi, S.J., writing to Archbishop Corrigan on September 3, 1898, spoke of this pamphlet, saying it was "written by a Cardinal (I have been told it was Cardinal Segna)." New York Archdiocesan Archives. William Barry, " 'Americanism', True and False," in *North American Review*, CLXIX (July, 1899), 41 also stated that it was the work of a cardinal.

[18] *L'Americanismo ovvero Riposta ad un Articolo dell' "Opinione Liberale" Sul P. Hecker* (Rome, 1898).

[19] Charles Maignen, *Le Père Hecker—Est-il Un Saint?* (Paris, 1898), p. 91.

races to the Church, he noted that this should never be sought "by trimming divine truth, nor by altering the constitution of the Church, nor by what are called concessions. Their return is to be hoped for by so presenting the divine truth to their minds that they can see that it is divine truth."[20] He did question the wisdom of using a traditional argument solely because it was traditional even when it struck no responsive chord in the listener. He much preferred to appeal to the questions in the minds of his audience and answer those questions with divine truth. As he said: "The bold attempt at subverting the world by error must be met with a bolder effort to captivate the world by truth. Everywhere and at all points the attack must be met with adequate, if possible with superior weapons of defence. New errors must be confronted with fresh aspects of old truths. So far as it is compatible with faith and piety, I am for accepting the American civilization with its usages and customs."[21]

The method he employed toward this end, he detailed in a letter to Cardinal Barnabò in July, 1863.

> In treating any doctrine of our holy faith with a view to convincing my audience, I considered first what want in our nature it was related to, and to which it addressed itself. This want being discovered, I developed and illustrated it until my hearers were fully convinced of its existence and importance. Then the question came up, Which religion recognizes this element or want of our nature, and meets all its legitimate demands? Does Protestantism? Its answers were given, and found either hostile or incomplete. Then the Catholic Church was interrogated, and she was found to recognize this want, and her answers adequate and satisfactory. These answers were then shown to be supported by the authority of Holy Scriptures.[22]

This was the same method he employed in his *Aspirations of Nature*, *Questions of the Soul*, and on the lecture platform. Obviously, there is nothing condemnable in such an approach. In fact, Leo XIII in his encyclical *Libertas* of June, 1888, commended such a method as "sound, when by this is meant a reasonable line of action, consistent with truth and justice; when, that is, in view of greater

[20] I. T. Hecker, *The Church and the Age*, p. 49.

[21] *Ibid.* Perfection Peculiar to the Paulist Community, a brochure compiled by Walter Elliott for the novices and fathers of the Paulist community.

[22] PFA, Hecker Papers. Also published in Walter Elliott, *Life of Father Hecker*, pp. 337-338.

good, the Church shows herself indulgent, and grants to the times whatever she can consistently with the holiness of her office."

Another point which the irreconcilables attacked was Hecker's statement: "the form of government of the United States is preferable to Catholics above other forms." This quotation appeared originally in Hecker's volume, *The Church and the Age*.[23] Elliott took it out of its setting and grouped it with other writings of Hecker in a chapter of the *Life* entitled: "Father Hecker's Idea of a Religious Community."[24] Maignen seized upon it as contradicting the Syllabus of Pius IX and the *Immortale Dei* of Leo XIII. Further, in his discussion of Hecker's supposed idea he naïvely added to the original words "preferable to other forms" the inclusive adjective "all"—"à toute autre," and he went on to say that Hecker advocated this American form of government for all Catholics everywhere.[25]

That this was not Hecker's idea a careful examination of the original passage in *The Church and the Age* will show. Hecker was discussing American institutions and he recalled how the democratic form of government in the United States had been pictured as hostile to the Catholic Church. His aim was to refute that charge. He reminded his readers that the Church, because of her divine constitution, could and had flourished under all forms of governments. Moreover, she was not committed to any form of civil government. However, practically speaking, she fared better under some than under others. Then he added that for Catholics in America the form of government in the United States was preferable to other forms existing in Europe. To quote his exact words: "We do not need the imperial or kingly ideas of the Old World as aids to our spiritual life as Catholics, any more than we want its anarchical ideas as helps to civil freedom as citizens." Then he specifically stated that the American form of government should not be considered the model nor the example for other countries. "Neither do we wish to plant our American ideas in the soil of other nations. The mission of the American Catholic is not to propagate his form of government in any other country. But there is one wish he cherishes in respect to

[23] p. 106.

[24] pp. 290-301.

[25] Maignen, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-176. Keane in a letter to Elliott on December 13, 1897, said that the "other side maintains Hecker's ideas are a norm for the Church in general." PFA, Americanism Papers.

his fellow-Catholics abroad: he wants to be rightly understood."[26] Anyone who will read his words on this point in an unprejudiced and uncaviling state of mind cannot help but understand his real meaning in which there is no taint of heresy nor contradiction to established teaching.

Perhaps no one of Father Hecker's ideas received wider attention than his references to the Holy Spirit in the soul. This was interpreted to mean direct action of the Holy Spirit independently of the Sacraments, and interior illumination of the mind apart from the normally-appointed channels of grace.[27]

So much was made of this misinterpretation that it was called to the attention of Elliott by Denis O'Connell.[28] The revival of "illuminism" was feared. Certainly anyone who read Maignen's diatribe could not help reaching such a conclusion but his explanation was anything but a reflection of Hecker's doctrine. Hecker never at any time suggested the separation of the action of the Holy Spirit from the Sacraments. In his *Aspirations of Nature* he spoke of the Sacraments as divinely-appointed channels of grace, necessary means for the presence of sanctifying grace and the operation of the Holy Spirit in the soul. When he wrote the preface to Mrs. George Ripley's translation of *Life and Doctrine of Saint Catherine of Genoa* he emphatically stated that it would be a mistake if individuals failed to realize "that the Sacraments have for their end to convey the Holy Spirit to the soul."[29] Again, he required as a cardinal principle of the spiritual life "observing and fortifying the ways and movements of the Spirit of God in our soul, employing for this purpose all the exercises of prayer, spiritual reading, the Sacraments,

[26] Isaac Hecker, *The Church and the Age*, p. 109.

[27] In a memorandum dated July 8, 1900, Father Elliott gave the substance of a conversation with Bishop Thomas S. Byrne of Nashville. The bishop was speaking of his visit to Rome and his conversation with Leo XIII which took place after the publication of *Testem Benevolentiae*. The bishop suggested the whole affair was unjust to American Catholics, and the Pope answered by saying that he had been given to understand that Father Hecker had taught the inspiration of the Holy Spirit without the sacraments. PFA, Americanism Papers. Elliott in a memorandum dated June 26, 1900, recalled a similar conversation with Bishop Spalding of Peoria. The Pope said to the bishop: "But there was that poor Hecker. He taught the guidance of the Holy Spirit without the Sacraments." Cf. Maignen, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-145; Keane to Elliott, December 13, 1897, PFA, Americanism Papers.

[28] PFA, Americanism Papers, July 12, 1898.

[29] (New York, 1874).

the practice of virtues and good works."[30] There were numerous other places in his writings where the same idea was stressed and there was no place where he suggested that the Holy Spirit was received into the soul and worked for man's sanctification completely independent of the sacramental system.

Undoubtedly, Hecker had a very strong devotion to the Holy Spirit. He was thoroughly convinced that the aim of Christianity was to lead all souls to sanctity through the action of the Holy Spirit in the soul. Constantly in his writings he called attention to this fact and pleaded for greater co-operation with the movement of divine grace. "The whole aim of the science of Christian perfection is to instruct men how to remove the hindrances in the way of the action of the Holy Spirit, and how to cultivate those virtues which are most favorable to His solicitations and inspirations."[31] But all of this was not to be attempted by the individual acting by himself. Hecker never meant that souls were to do without spiritual directors. He recognized the terrible danger of self-deception and delusion which alone could be avoided through spiritual direction. He specified the function such direction would fulfill "in discovering the obstacles in the way of Divine guidance, in aiding and encouraging the penitent to remove them and in teaching how the interior movements of the Holy Spirit may be recognized as well as in stimulating the soul to fidelity and docility to His movements."[32]

So obviously orthodox were the words of Hecker in this respect that Maignen was forced to conclude "il n'y à qu'à les approuver sans reserve."[33] But immediately following that admission Maignen concluded that Hecker meant more than his words implied and he proceeded to build up a case against him, using as evidence two sentences taken from an article in the *Revue du Clergé Français* of March 1, 1898, written by Abbé Dufresne. This interpretation drawn from Hecker's words by Dufresne was by no means imputable to Hecker himself and it needs no explanation here. Incidentally, after using this quotation of Dufresne, Maignen exultantly explained why he seized upon it. "En vérité, les admirateurs d'Hecker nous rendent la tâche facile!"[34] Hecker could not be condemned by his

[30] Hecker, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[32] Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 308.

[33] Maignen, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

[34] *Op. cit.*, p. 114.

own words, so an interpretation drawn from the words of another was just as acceptable to aid in the condemnation of the man he set out to villify.

A more judicious and open mind than Maignen and his cohorts brought to their work might have acknowledged the correctness of Hecker's position and pointed to possible dangers in his ideas on the Holy Spirit. The Master of the Palace, Albert Lepidi, O.P., did this for Monsignor O'Connell.[35] Hecker himself had anticipated just such an objection. He admitted that internal illumination could give birth to pride, self-sufficiency, and rebellion, but only if the individual disregarded the external criterion of authority. "Whenever by supposition such a collision takes place be assured it is not the work of the Holy Spirit but the consequences of ignorance, error or perversity on the part of the individual."[36] The soul was never to be a law unto itself, nor a court of last appeal. "If a man be moved by the Holy Spirit, he will be most obedient to his superior; and he will not only be submissive to the authority of the Church, but careful to follow out her spirit."[37]

The question of the vows in the religious life was also brought into the discussion and in the same spirit of distortion and exaggeration.[38] Hecker and his associates in founding the Paulist Fathers had decided to bind themselves to a life of perfection and apostolic works by a voluntary compact in the form of promises rather than by vows. In this action they were following the example of St. Philip Neri in the establishment of the Oratorians. Elliott in explaining this bond between the members of the Paulist Community, permitted himself an expression which could reflect on those who had taken the vows. "Men of stable character need no vow to guarantee adherence to a divine vocation and men of feeble character may indeed vow themselves into an outward stability, but it is of little fruit to themselves personally and their irremovability is often of infinite distress to their superiors and brethren."[39] This was immediately seized by the irreconcilables as an unjustified attack on

[35] O'Connell to Elliott, July 12, 1898, PFA, Americanism Papers.

[36] Isaac Hecker, *The Church and the Age*, p. 172.

[37] Perfection Peculiar to the Paulist Community, p. 25.

[38] Klein to Elliott, Sept. 9, 1897, PFA, Americanism Papers. Somewhat similar observations were made in reviews of *La Vie du Père Hecker* in *Revue Thomiste* and *Revue Bénédictine*, for September, 1897.

[39] Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

the personal character of religious community members bound by vows. Nothing was further from the mind of Father Elliott. He was explaining the decision that motivated the early Paulists in their selection of promises rather than vows. True, some of his words might have been unwisely chosen, but that should not have reflected on Hecker as Maignen made it appear. It was rather significant that in his discussion of the vows and the Paulist Community, Maignen did not refer to these words of Hecker: "The true Paulist should be fit and ready to take the solemn vows at any moment."[40]

Any impartial observer who reads the mass of literature in pamphlet, book, or manuscript form cannot help but conclude that in this entire controversy over Hecker's views theological principles played a much lesser role than personalities. This fact stands out very clearly in the correspondence between S. Brandi, S. J., editor of the *Civiltà Cattolica* and Archbishop Corrigan of New York, as well as in the letters from O'Connell, Keane, and Ireland to Walter Elliott. Since this fact might seem to those unfamiliar with the controversy a begging of the question, the writer would like to cite a few concrete instances.

After Maignen's book *Le Père Hecker Est-il Un Saint?* had been published, the Paulist Fathers through their Superior General, Father Deshon, drew up a memorial for presentation to the archbishops of the United States in their meeting of October, 1898. Since Archbishop Corrigan was their ecclesiastical superior, he was requested to present the document to the meeting. Following is the text of the protest:

> To the Archbishops Assembled in Annual Meeting:
>
> Your Graces:
>
> It is known to you that under the title "Études sur l'Américainisme. Le Père Hecker, Est-il Un Saint?" there has been published a book in both French and English by the Rev. Charles Maignen, in which some of the Archbishops of the American hierarchy by name have been attacked and Father Hecker and the Paulist Community in particular have been assailed and charged with teaching opinions that are, if not contra fidem, at least in opposition to the spirit and teachings of the best theologians of the Church.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 250.

It might not be the part of wisdom to notice these accusations just now, except for the fact that many of the learned and devoted Prelates of the Church in Europe have been impressed by these accusations.

The Life of Father Hecker, around which the controversy particularly rages was published ten years ago, carefully scrutinized by Very Rev. A. F. Hewit as Censor Deputatus, and published under the Imprimatur of the Most Rev. Archbishop of New York. During these ten years while the book has been extensively circulated both in this country and in England not a word of accusation was made against it; and only since its translation into French has any difficulty arisen. It was written in English for English readers, and expresses an adaptation of the conservative truths of Holy Church to the new political and social conditions especially in America. The French translation was published somewhat over a year ago with some omissions and inaccuracies. Appearing at a time when a bitter controversy raged among Catholics in France, mainly inspired by political antagonisms, this translation has been attacked and defended by the parties to that controversy with incredible violence. Abbé Maignen's book is the bitterest and most prominent of the assailants. His calumnies against American Prelates and American Catholics generally, can be considered by you without suggestion from us.

But we are in duty bound to protest emphatically against his attacks on the Paulists, which are utterly untruthful, and, seemingly, malicious.

It may be said in all truth that the Paulists are known to their Archbishop as men who are faithful in duty, submissive to discipline, obedient to ecclesiastical authority and zealous in the prosecution of apostolic labors.

The accusations of heterodoxy against Father Hecker may be gathered under three heads. The first concerns the devotion to the Holy Spirit. In this matter we beg to submit that Father Hecker's teachings are identical with the teachings of the Fathers and theologians of the Church as well as the doctors of mystical theology. An explicit statement of his spiritual doctrine on this point may be found in Chap. XXVII of his Life.

Second, as to spiritual direction. It is a mistake to say that Father Hecker was opposed to all spiritual direction. He firmly believed in the necessity of direction, and in practice himself always consulted men of experience and piety.

Third, as to the question of vows, the teachings of Father Hecker are in accord with the teachings of St. Philip Neri, Père Lallement, S.J., and other respected authorities on this subject. As is stated by Father Elliott in the Life, p. 299, "It never entered into the minds of

the Fathers to question the doctrine and practice of the Church concerning vows." Father Hecker's test of a true Paulist was that he should be fit and ready to take the solemn vows at any moment.

The separation of the Paulists from the Redemptorists is also made a peg on which are hung many misstatements of facts, perverse views of the difficulty which led to the separation, and baseless recriminations which serve only to wound charity and set against each other zealous missionary priests. A relationship of extreme cordiality and warm mutual friendship exists between the Paulists and the Redemptorists of this country.

Abbé Maignen's book is calculated to breed discord and strife. Moreover the public reopening of this question, long since thoroughly investigated and finally settled by the Holy See itself, is a constructive insult to the decisions of Rome.

In regard to certain dangerous movements among the French clergy resulting in some apostasies, and other evil signs of the times which Abbé Maignen attributes to views like Father Hecker's, no one, as is well known to you, could be more sensitive to evil-bearing movements, more vigilant in guarding the treasures of truth, or more courageous in antagonising enemies of the Church than Father Hecker himself and his community. Abbé Maignen seems to have conjured up an evil spectre of his own imagination which he calls "Americanism," and to the pernicious influence of this baneful spirit he attributes some notorious apostasies which have recently happened in France. While we are not without some evils to lament in this country, still it is well known that there is no portion of the Universal Church where the faith is so strong and where its expansion is so remarkable and where it bears such fruit in devout and practical Catholics as in these United States. Father Hecker and the Paulists have always been welcome and at home among all classes of Catholics in this country. The Catholics of America can truthfully affirm that their devotion to the Holy See is as strong, and their love for the Holy Father as warm and as earnest as that which may be found in any other part of the Lord's Vineyard.

Another alleged fault of "Americanism" is that individuality is extolled by Father Hecker, and that religious humility and obedience are thereby injured. With a little honesty, not to mention charity, it would be impossible to form such an opinion. Father Hecker was a man of high mental gifts and of great activity, completely occupied in promoting the glory of God, but he was entirely humble. He thought the individual should use all his mental endowments for God's glory, and that superiors and subjects, clergy and laity should be active, and make the most of their talents and opportunities. He saw no opposition between individuality and obedience. Abbé Maig-

nen does his best to pander to the idea that prevails with many in Europe that Americans are all inclined to be rebels, and he interprets individuality as nothing better than rebellion against lawful authority.

In view of the foregoing statements it is earnestly hoped that some action will be taken in reference to this book. Such a bitter and calumnious attack on American Catholics deserves to be officially resented and the eminent Prelates and persons of Europe who already half believe that there is some truth in Abbé Maignen's affirmations should be disabused of any such delusions.

In order to avoid strife the Paulist Fathers have hitherto abstained from taking any notice of this book.

For the Paulist Fathers
George Deshon, Superior[41]

Archbishop Corrigan read the memorial at the meeting and immediately moved that since Cardinal Gibbons had received a reassuring letter from Cardinal Rampolla stating that there was nothing to fear in the matter, the American archbishops had no need to interfere. His motion was carried. This was on October 14, 1898. On February 24, 1899, Archbishop Ireland wrote to Father Deshon: "A Cardinal whose name is not to be written said: 'Corrigan has written to Lepidi a letter of approval and congratulations' and I read the letter."[42] This letter of approval was for Lepidi's *imprimatur* to Maignen's *Le Père Hecker*. No wonder then that the archbishop could say to Elliott, meeting with him when the controversy was most intense: "The main trouble with your *Life of Father Hecker* at Rome is due to your connection with Archbishop Ireland and Bishop Keane, who are in great disfavor there. If you will repudiate them all will go well."[43] Obviously, the Archbishop of New York recognized the whole difficulty as far as Hecker and the Paulists were concerned was one of personalities.

Another interesting instance was cited by Denis O'Connell to Elliott in a letter dated July 12, 1898, and it came as the result of an interview with Lepidi:

> I said to him that if they really wished peace, all this matter could be arranged in five minutes. You say, I went on, that after all there is nothing against faith or morals in the Life of Father Hecker, only

---

[41] PFA, Americanism Papers.

[42] PFA, Americanism Papers, February 24, 1899. Cf. O'Connell to Elliott, December 10, 1898.

[43] *Ibid.* A note made by Father Elliott after an interview with Archbishop Corrigan.

expressions and dangerous tendencies, that even his doctrine itself about the Holy Ghost is perfectly conformable with Catholic Theology, but it should not be made a doctrine for the people, nor represented as something new. Besides all that you present to us as Americanism we reject. So now, if you wish peace, let us do so. Take the Life of Father H. and your pen. Correct as freely as you please, insert what you please and I guarantee to have a new edition made on those corrections. As for what you call Americanism, note down all you find faulty in it and I guarantee to have it all publicly repudiated. That pleased him and he said he wanted only some time to prepare the notes and to take counsel 'upstairs.' (He lives on the ground floor of the Vatican.) The notes for the new edition of the Life, he could not have ready before the end of the vacations, the other notes on Amer. he would prepare at once. . . . I took up the point that Mgr. Keane insisted on, that the *imprimatur* be not given to any new edition of Maignen. He was pleased with all this and remarked how with a little charity, everything could be arranged. He asked me to return Friday. I did so. Everything was changed. He could do nothing.[44]

One cannot help feeling that if the entire matter were one of theological content, or simply a lack of preciseness in the use of terms and ideas, it could have been settled as O'Connell suggested in the above letter. But where personalities were involved, tempers were ruffled, sensibilities were offended, and partisanship was in full swing. At one point in the controversy, O'Connell complained in a letter to Elliott "these men are not honest and it is an illusion to treat them so."[45]

Further, Pope Leo XIII recognized the bitterness that the entire conflict had engendered. He had been urged by the irreconcilibles to be severe with the Americans but he said to Cardinal Serafino that he was convinced that "gentle measure would do more good."[46] During the summer of 1898 everything was prepared for the condemnation of Hecker and the "Americanists" and the decree was placed on the Pope's desk for his signature. Just about that time, a letter came from Cardinal Gibbons strongly condemning Maignen's book, warmly defending Hecker's orthodoxy and the zeal of the American episcopate, protesting the *imprimatur* that had been given to Maignen, and pleading for justice for the clergy and the Church

[44] *Ibid.*

[45] *Ibid.*, August 22, 1898.

[46] Keane to Gibbons, November 9, 1898, Baltimore Cathedral Archives, 96-S-8.

in America. As O'Connell said of this letter: "It shook them."[47] As a result, the Pope said he would not sign the decree and he added: "I can do no more against those Americans. Moreover, I reserve now the entire affair to myself and I permit no more examinations of books or anything else. I will arrange all myself with an encyclical."[48] The result was *Testem Benevolentiae*. Satolli and Mazella, both of whom had lived a number of years in the United States, wrote the body of the letter, but the Holy Father with Cardinal Rampolla prepared the beginning and the end.

Unquestionably, had the original draft been signed by the Holy Father it would have produced a painful situation both here and abroad. But the corrected, definitive document coming directly from the hand of the Vicar of Christ lifted the pronouncement out of the shadow of partisanship into the clear, calm light of impartial judgment. In that light, the actual teachings of Hecker stand forth unblemished. It is only the caricature of his ideas—half truth at best, largely misunderstandings, with some deliberate distortion—which Leo XIII condemned, ideas distorted in desperate defense by those opposed to the *Ralliement*.

VINCENT F. HOLDEN

Paulist Information Center
New York City

[47] O'Connell to Elliott, December 10, 1898, PFA, Americanism Papers.

[48] Ireland to Elliott, February 24, 1899, PFA, Americanism Papers.

MISCELLANY

American Contributions to the Catholic Missionary Effort in China in the Twentieth Century*

The scope of a paper on the American contribution to the Catholic missionary effort in China is really not limited by the phrase, "in the twentieth century." The Catholic Church in the United States was itself a mission church until the present century and it is only in the last twenty-five years that Americans have taken any organized steps in the foreign mission fields of the Universal Church. Previous to 1908 the Church in the United States was directly under the jurisdiction of the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide. It had grown rapidly and for the most part by immigration from Europe. A goodly number of the priests and religious were foreign-born. They had come to the United States to work among their own national groups and very rightly considered themselves as foreign missionaries to the United States.

In another sense, the Catholic Church in this country was a mission church. In the first year of its establishment, 1822, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith forwarded to the United States the sum of $2757, which was more than half of the total collected for that year. An annual subsidy to the Church in the United States continued during the next hundred years and by 1922 we had received more than seven million dollars from the Society. The first record of American contribution to the Society is for the year 1883, when the sum of $6.00 was forwarded from the United States to the international headquarters in Europe. The following year Cardinal Gibbons promised to support the Society. This small donation and promise of future help was the turning point. Five years later the United States gave to the Society a sum which was larger by $10,000 than the amount received from the Society for that year. The annual contribution of the Church in the United States increased until in 1925 it became the largest individual contribution to the Society. During the nineteenth century we also received aid from the Ludwigmissionsverein of Bavaria and from the Leopoldine Foundation of Austria.

The missionary status of the Church in this country precluded all thought of sending missionaries to other lands. There was but one exception previous to the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Bishop John England of Charleston, during a visit to Rome early in 1833, had submitted a memoir to Propaganda regarding the situation in West Africa

* Read as a paper at the Twenty-Fifth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Chicago, December 29, 1944.

and Liberia in particular. Power to deal with this matter was subsequently granted by Rome to the Second Provincial Council of Baltimore later that year. This led to the appointment of Edward Barron, vicar general of the Diocese of Philadelphia as Prefect Apostolic of Upper Guinea. Father Barron sailed for Monrovia in 1841, having as companion Father John Kelly of the Diocese of New York. Both missionaries were Irish-born.

In 1889 the future Cardinal Vaughan, then Bishop of Salford, the founder of the Mill Hill Society of England and the father of modern English Catholic missions, in a letter to Cardinal Gibbons, touched on the matter of American participation in foreign mission work.[1] He urged that regardless of the necessity of home mission work in the United States personnel should be sent to foreign fields. He pointed out the danger to our own faith unless it be shared with others. What effect this letter had on Cardinal Gibbons at the time we do not know, but twenty years later he was to be a prominent factor in the establishing of the first American foreign mission seminary. About the same time that Bishop Vaughan wrote, small groups of Americans were leaving our shores for foreign fields, but in most cases the individuals were foreign-born and only attached to some religious house in the United States. The number was small and there was no concentration of action in any field. Between 1881 and 1888 five Franciscans left the United States for China. Only one was native-born. Two Sisters of Charity, Sister Catherine Bushman and Sister Joanna O'Connell, both of them American-born, were in China.

It was after the turn of the century that interest became manifest in many quarters regarding American participation in actual missionary work. In 1906 a meeting of four priests in Boston founded a Catholic Foreign Mission Society. Later the name was changed to the Catholic Mission Bureau. The purpose as expressed in the records of the meeting was, "to organize a literary propaganda with a view to deepen and widen the missionary spirit in the United States, having as its ultimate end the establishment of a Foreign Mission Seminary." The propaganda included the publication of the *Field Afar,* a bimonthly mission review. It is from the pages of this magazine that one realizes that many individuals were aware of the fact that it was time for the Church in the United States to send missioners into foreign fields. A writer in the *Ecclesiastical Review* of December, 1906, urged the foundation of a seminary for foreign missions. A priest from Washington, D. C., asked why we had no seminary like to Mill Hill. Father William Frazer, writing from China, questioned why we did not see the need for apostles from the United States. Bishop Chatron of Japan wrote in a like vein. It was pointed out that

[1] The text of this letter will be found in the *Catholic Historical Review,* XXX (October, 1944), 290-298.

while American bishops had been appointed to sees in the Philippine Islands, they had to turn to the Mill Hill Society of England for priests. It was recorded with astonishment that Canada had forty priests and 140 nuns on the missions and most of them from the Province of Quebec, while Catholic missionaries from the United States numbered less than fourteen.

The publication of such inquiries and facts bore fruit. Religious orders and congregations, the Franciscans, Jesuits, Brothers of Mary, the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, and others were pointing out to their American subjects the pathway to the heathen apostolate. Individual priests were found who for years had been praying for the realization of an American seminary for foreign missions. Twenty years after the foundation of the Society of the Divine Word in Holland an American house of the Society was opened at Techny, Illinois, but there was at that time no effort to recruit vocations in this country. In 1909 they opened St. Mary's Mission House and announced they were ready to receive vocations for foreign mission work. The Holy Ghost Fathers made known that they, too, would accept vocations for the missions. There was not a single community of women in the United States in 1910 which would accept a vocation and give promise of future missionary work. One community in Canada stated that they would accept such vocations from the United States if the candidates spoke French. In the petition to Rome for the establishment of the Society of the Atonement in 1910, Father Paul Francis asked and obtained permission to embrace eventually the idea of foreign missions in the scope of his society. The thought of foreign missions was uppermost in the minds of many when Fathers James A. Walsh and Thomas F. Price met at Montreal and the first steps were taken toward the establishment of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society, which was to be commonly known as Maryknoll. The society owed to Cardinal Gibbons the strong impulse which brought it into being through the unanimous action of the archbishops representing the American hierarchy. In his letter to the archbishops, Cardinal Gibbons mentioned the letter of Cardinal Vaughan twenty years before and urged that "we should not delay lest our own Faith should suffer." Archbishop Falconio, the Apostolic Delegate to the United States, welcomed the idea and remarked that it was time that the American Church should move in this direction. From no quarter was there any criticism of the Church in America for not having taken the step at a previous date, but all agreed that it was time to do so.

Both Techny and Maryknoll had their major seminaries and preparatory colleges before the outbreak of World War I, but neither had had time to ordain priests and send them to the missions. It was the war and its aftermath which gave the great impulse to American Catholic missions. The quarter century from 1918 to 1943 was to record the first

movement in force of Catholic missionaries from the United States. A mere handful of American Catholic missionaries could be found in all the missions in 1918, but there were 2896 in the field at the end of 1943. Of these China had the largest group—635.

There does not seem to be any reason other than expediency behind the fact that China was to claim the largest group of American missionaries. It had been pointed out by many that the English language was being studied more and more in the schools of China and that any English-speaking missionary, and particularly an American, would enjoy advantages which would be denied those of other nationalities. It was also evident that China was our neighbor across the mutual boundary of the Pacific and American interest in the Orient was mounting. However, the outstanding fact was that the Catholic missionary forces in China were in need of recruits. World War I had depleted the ranks of the Chinese missions, one-third of the French missionaries being mobilized. The majority of the missionaries in China were French, twenty-five of the fifty-three vicariates being almost entirely French. There was an evident need for immediate help. In the case of each of the American congregations of priests going to China, there was already a point of contact with the Chinese missions, except in the case of the Passionists, who requested a mission and were assigned by the Holy See to China. There have been groups of nuns and one small group of secular priests who had worked in China under European superiors and without previous contact with China. In each of these cases it was the European bishop in China who sought the aid of the American group. This was done by Bishops Weig of Tsingtao, Jarre of Tsinanfu, Galvin of Hanyang, and Tacconi of Kaifeng.

In a sketch of this length it would be impossible to treat in any adequate manner the work of all the fifty-three groups of priests and sisters who were working in China at the outbreak of the present war, or even to give detailed account of the fourteen missions which have been entrusted to the American groups. At most there can be but a short enumeration of them. The American contribution to the Catholic effort in China can be judged today only by the number of American Catholic missionaries in the field. The pioneer band of each group has been initiated into missionary work by the experienced Europeans who preceded them. The aim of the American group has been that of their predecessors, namely, to convert the greatest number of Chinese in the shortest possible time consistent with safety, the assurance of complete conversion, and the promise of persevering steadfastness. To date there has been no evidence of American initiative in introducing new methods of missionary procedure in China. They have brought to China the enthusiasm and strength of youth, which in turn produced renewed courage and hope to those who had already borne the burden of years.

The proof of effective contribution will be shown by the success of the American groups in attaining the end they have in view. However, it is not possible at this time to give any exact and complete figures for the Americans.[2] Statistics for the entire period can be secured only from China or Rome. Neither of these sources can be consulted at this time. In the statistics which we have been able to compile, even for those missions which have been entrusted to Americans, one finds European and Chinese priests and sisters working side by side with the Americans. Again, a large number, 196, or thirty percent, of the entire American group are working in missions entrusted to non-American societies and the statistics of the missions are not divided according to results attained by individuals. To pro-rate the number of conversions in a given mission is not desirable. It can, however, be said with certainty that in no instance has the American effort been disappointing, nor has the percentage of conversions for any American group been notably lower than the average for all of China.

There are at present fourteen missions entrusted to Americans, nine vicariates, four prefectures, and one independent mission. These missions embrace a territory of 215,000 square miles with a total population of close to fifty million people. The territory is almost equal to France both in extent and total population. Of the fifty million people only 195,000 are Catholic, about one-third of one percent. None of the area taken over by American groups could strictly speaking be referred to as virgin territory, but all of it was and still is very definitely mission territory. To the Franciscans belongs the honor of having sent the first missionaries to China. In the years from 1881 to 1922 twelve priests and two brothers, representing all four provinces of the Friars Minor in the United States, left for China. The organized work of the Franciscans did not start until 1922. To them belongs the honor of being the first Americans to be entrusted with a mission in China, that of Wuchang in 1923. Today the American Franciscans have four missions in China, one for each of the four provinces in the United States. The missions are the Vicariates of Wuchang and Chawtsun, the Prefecture of Shasi, and the independent mission of Yaowan.

The first organized effort in China was by the Maryknoll Fathers, whose first band sailed for the Orient in 1918. They now have five missions

---

[2] A list of the Catholic missionaries in China will be found in *A Missionary Index of Catholic Americans* (Cincinnati, 1944), compiled and printed by the Catholic Students' Mission Crusade. A number of errors have been noted in this volume in the section on China, where whole groups have been omitted and some of those listed are not United States citizens. Statistics for the missions entrusted to American groups will be found in *Annuaire des Missions Catholiques des Chine*, 39e Année (Shanghai, 1941).

entrusted to them, four in the Kwang provinces of South China, Kongmoon, Kaying, Wuchow, and Kweilin and one in Manchuria, the Vicariate of Fushun. At the outbreak of the present war they had the greatest number of American priests in China, since the great majority of Maryknoll missionaries have labored in China. Each of their five missions have been taken over from the French priests of the Missions Etrangères de Paris. The third group to be entrusted with a mission field was the Passionist Fathers. The first recruits departed in 1921 and, being the first of their order to work in China, they fulfilled an expressed desire of their founder 150 years before. The Vicariate of Yuanling in Hunan province was placed in their care in 1925.

The first American Vincentians left the eastern province of the United States in 1921 and were followed by those of the western province. Each today has its own vicariate, that of Yukiang being entrusted to the western province and the Vicariate of Kanchow which is in charge of the eastern province. The American Dominicans sent their first priests to China in 1923 to bring aid to the Spanish Dominicans in Kukien province. A section of that territory was erected a prefecture apostolic in 1931 and this new mission of Kienow was assigned to the American group.

An appeal to the American headquarters of the Society of the Divine Word for recruits for the China missions of the Society was the occasion for the first departure in 1919. The small band was made up of one priest and two seminarians, Robert Clarke and Clifford King, who were to be the first American priests ordained in China. Members of the society continued to work with their European confreres until they were given their own mission of Sinsiang in 1936. Of special interest has been the work of this group in connection with the Catholic University of Peking, which they took over from the American Benedictines. The control of the University is in the hands of the American group of the society, although the faculty is, as would be expected, of an international character.

The American Jesuits, whose combined provinces have sent the largest number of priests to the missions, are not as strongly represented in China as in other mission countries. However, the largest group of American priests working in a China mission not entrusted to their own province, is that of the Jesuits of the California province. They have been engaged in teaching at Gonzaga College in Shanghai and in parish work in the Vicariate of Nanking. The Marianists of Dayton, Ohio, have supplied American members to the faculties of their own schools in Tsinan and Hankow and to the Department of English of the Catholic University of Peking. In lesser numbers there have been members of the Capuchins, Benedictines, Black Franciscans, Stimatine Fathers, and Viatorians who have labored in China with their European confreres. In December, 1941, the total number of American priests and brothers in China was 380.

The record of American sisterhoods in China is satisfying, and to many surprising. There were strong doubts in the minds of many regarding the ability of the American youth to stand the rigors and hardships of missionary life and in these same minds there was something akin to certainty that American youth would not volunteer for missionary work. Such doubts naturally included the young women of America. In the last twenty years the sisterhoods of the United States have proven such doubts to be without foundation. In every case where there has been a request for sisters for foreign mission work, the volunteers have far outnumbered the few who could be sent to the missions at that time. More than 1200 such volunteers have been sent to the missions and 291 of these were in the China missions when Pearl Harbor was attacked in December, 1941.

The promise for the future is great because there are twenty-seven different groups of nuns represented in this total of 291. The Maryknoll Sisters, who are professionally foreign missionaries, are the only group represented in force, there being seventy-eight members of that congregation in China. The other twenty-six congregations are destined to send larger groups to their foundations in China. Chinese young women have been admitted into many of these congregations. They have been brought to the United States for their novitiate and in many instances they have returned to their homeland not only as professed religious, but as college graduates or registered nurses. Every type of American sisterhood is represented in China: the contemplative sisters, Adorers of the Precious Blood of Manchester, New Hampshire, seven branches of the great Franciscan family and four of the Charity group, the Sisters of Providence and the Religious of the Sacred Heart, the Sisters of St. Joseph and those of Notre Dame, Dominicans and Benedictines, Sisters of Loretto, the Helpers of the Holy Souls, Ursulines, Holy Ghost Sisters, and the Sisters of the Sacred Heart.

The fourteen American missions in China are being aided by thirteen of the American sisterhoods with a total of 160 sisters. Sixteen of the congregations with a total of 131 sisters are laboring in missions entrusted to European clergy. The work of the sisters includes all of the usual tasks. The contemplative nuns are cloistered in China as elsewhere. Teaching, nursing, the care of orphans and the aged, training of native sisters and actual catechetical work fall to the lot of the other groups. In the case of the sisters, statistical records are even less available at this time than in the case of the priests.

The latest reliable statistics for all of the American missions in China are for the year 1939-1940. They give an idea of the work of the seventy percent of our missionaries who labored in that year in the fourteen American missions. Three hundred and fifteen priests and brothers were aided by six European, five Canadian, and eighty Chinese priests, 160 American, nine Canadian, and ninety-two Chinese sisters. In preparation

for ordination to the priesthood there were sixty-nine major and 314 minor Chinese seminarians. Baptisms for the year totaled 37,147. In works of charity, ten of the missions had opened thirty-six orphanages and there were at that time 2,513 orphans in these institutions. Eight of the missions had rescued 6,783 abandoned babies in that year. Hospitals in four of the missions had 1,845 in-patients and ninety-five dispensaries administered 959,935 treatments in the twelve months while 1,297 aged Chinese were in old folks homes conducted by eight missions. There was one leper asylum with 438 inmates.

In the educational field particular attention was given to lower schools. There were 270 grammar schools with an enrollment of 11,756 students and 656 rudiment schools with 13,713 students. There were five high schools with a total of 273 students. The Marianists, Jesuits, Society of the Divine Word, Sisters of the Holy Ghost, and the Religious of the Sacred Heart were engaged in higher educational work in institutions which were staffed in greater part by non-American faculties. Since 1932 there has been an American priest as member of the Synodal Commission in Peking.

The past twenty-five years have been eventful in China. No part of the large country has been without misfortune and catastrophe of one sort or another. Civil war and a foreign invasion, bandits and Reds, famine and flood have all had their part. There is not one mission in China which has not been affected at one time or another. Such misfortunes have offered occasion for greater works of charity. These efforts in behalf of the Chinese have been appreciated as is evidenced by numerous statements by China's leaders. Yet at the same time missionary work has been hindered. On many occasions it has been necessary for the missionaries to flee from the immediate locality of their missions and to return when it was safe to do so. The most widespread effect came with the attack on Pearl Harbor. About one-half of the American missionaries were immediately removed from their missions and placed in internment. Most of the remaining half have been driven from their missions in the last year with the Japanese advance southward and westward. In this quarter-century fifty-three priests, brothers, and sisters have died in China. Four priests have met with violent deaths at the hands of bandits and eight others have spent periods in captivity. They have been trying years in many respects and the American group as a whole has proven beyond doubt that regardless of trials and difficulties, they can and have endured and gone on with their work patiently, joyfully, and hopefully.

They have worked in Manchuria and in seventeen of the eighteen provinces of China proper, Yunnan being the only province where there has been no American Catholic missionary. The mere presence of the American Catholic in China has helped to dispel two erroneous opinions

which were present in the Chinese mind. The first was that Catholic was synonymous with French and the second was that the United States was one hundred percent Protestant. These false ideas had arisen because of the predominence of the French and Americans in the foreign personnel of the two major Christian denominations in China before World War I.

One fact more than any other stands out when reviewing the statistics of the American missions in China, the need of a larger foreign personnel, if the rate of conversions is to continue at the figure reached in the last quarter century. Each American priest in China had an average of 618 Catholics under his care. In the United States at the same time there was one priest for every 620 Catholics. The averages of the two countries are so close as to make it evident that the American missionary in China will be tied down and prevented from actual missionary work unless there are more recruits from the United States. It is certain that with the coming peace China will again be faced with a shortage of priests. France and Germany will for some time to come find themselves unable to supply priests for foreign mission work. America's contribution to Catholic missionary effort in China has been satisfying, but at best it can be considered as only a beginning.

STATISTICS OF AMERICAN CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN CHINA, 1939-1940

Mission	Year Entrusted to Group	Group in Charge	Total Area in Thousand Square Miles	Total Population in Millions	Number of Catholics	Foreign Clergy	Native Clergy	Foreign Sisters	Native Sisters	Foreign Brothers	Major Seminarians	Minor Seminarians	Total Baptisms
Wuchang	1923	OFM	4.0	2.5	12,898	15	8	36	6	1	8	30	5,512
Kongmoon	1924	MM	40.0	6.0	9,418	27	6	8	12	3	12	49	4,925
Yuangling	1925	CP	15.4	4.5	7,381	44*	.....	25†	.....	.....	1	11	1,613
Kaying	1929	MM	21.0	2.6	19,567	31	8	15	.....	.....	8	22	1,914
Chawtsun	1929	OFM	11.0	3.0	29,227	19	3	21	8	.....	13	58	5,686
Yukiang	1929	CM	16.0	4.5	26,826	28‡	32	6	.....	.....	8	41	3,095
Wuchow	1930	MM	15.0	3.55	11,922	26	3	6§	5	1	3	18	1,535
Kanchow	1931	CM	15.0	4.0	18,658	24	14	6	36	.....	4	11	5,195
Kienow	1931	OP	4.5	1.0	1,003	10	.....	6	.....	2	2	11	224
Fushun	1932	MM	37.0	6.25	10,332	33	5	29	2	2	9	42	2,643
Sinsiang	1936	SVD	14.0	2.0	13,007	17	1	5	1	3	1	15	2,824
Shasi	1936	OFM	4.5	3.5	6,340	22	6	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	716
Kweilin	1938	MM	15.0	2.5	3,008	20	.....	6	.....	.....	.....	.....	628
Yaowan	1939	OFM	3.0	3.0	24,996	10	.....	.....	12	1	.....	.....	1,017
TOTALS			215.0	48.9	194,783	326	80	169	92	15	69	314	37,147

* — includes five Canadian priests from Scarboro Bluffs.

† — includes six Canadian sisters.

‡ — includes six European Vincentians.

§ — includes three Canadian sisters.

STATISTICS OF AMERICAN CATHOLIC MISSIONS IN CHINA, 1939-1940

MISSION	ORPHANAGES	ORPHANS	ABANDONED CHILDREN	HOSPITAL PATIENTS	OLD FOLKS IN HOMES	GRAMMAR SCHOOL	STUDENTS	RUDIMENT SCHOOL	STUDENTS	HIGHSCHOOL	STUDENTS	DISPENSARIES	DISPENSARY TREATMENTS
Wuchang	3	340	2,023	1,140	892	4	217	27	1,296	.....	.....	8	98,495
Kongmoon	8	313	3,830	340	21	9	528	20	436	.....	.....	19	134,038
Yuangling	5	136	72	.....	54	10	681	21	535	.....	.....	10	72,722
Kaying	.....	.....	.....	.....	10	14	936	8	265	.....	.....	.....	.....
Chawtsun	1	48	108	.....	.....	50	1,220	254	3,200	.....	.....	4	72,174
Yukiang	4	652	395	53	103	17	999	52	3,020	1	43	4	46,340
Wuchow	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	95	15	371	.....	.....	9	89,983
Kanchow	2	726	215	321	79	18	1,221	36	598	.....	.....	10	109,007
Kienow	1	66	50	.....	.....	8	508	11	286	.....	.....	5	27,297
Fushun	9	99	.....	.....	82	13	1,194	13	983	2	140	9	37,752
Sinsiang	1	38	.....	.....	.....	60	1,991	93	1,497	.....	.....	3	47,742
Shasi	2	95	90	.....	16	13	843	55	1,226	2	90	3	142,805
Kweilin	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	19	.....	.....	.....	.....	10	81,580
Yaowan	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	51	1,308	51	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
TOTALS	36	2,513	6,783	1,854	1,257	270	11,756	656	13,713	5	273	95	959,935

JOSEPH P. RYAN

Maryknoll, New York

ADELE CUTTS, SECOND WIFE OF STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS*

Statemen's wives sometimes prove to be interesting personages. Among such is the Catholic wife of Stephen A. Douglas, one of the outstanding statesmen of his time, in whose life Adele Cutts, as his second wife, played an important part at a period when he was at the peak of his political career.

Adele Cutts was of the seventh generation of the family of Robert Cutts who, with his brother John, emigrated to America in the middle of the seventeenth century and settled in Maine.[1] Her grandfather, Richard Cutts, a Harvard graduate, was a member of the House of Representatives of the United States during the two terms of Jefferson and the first of Madison.[2] During this time, he made the city of Washington his home, building one of the most pretentious houses of the capital in those early

* Part of a dissertation for the degree of master of arts submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of the Catholic University of America.

[1] Cecil Hampden Cutts Howard, *Genealogy of the Cutts Family in America* (Albany, 1892).

[2] *Annals of the Congress of the United States, Seventh Congress*, XI, 310.

days for his bride, Anna Payne, sister of Dolly Madison.[3] His son, James Madison, Adele's father, was named at the request of his aunt, the celebrated Dolly, for her distinguished husband. James Madison Cutts married Miss Ellen Elizabeth Neale of the old Catholic Neale family of Maryland.[4] Adele's heritage as far as her ancestry was concerned, was a rich one—on the paternal side, ancestors who took active part in the community and civic development of colonial and "young Republic" days; on her maternal side, ancestors who were prominent, not only in civic activity, but also in religious. By the posterity of Madame Anna Neale, wife of James Neale who founded the Maryland Neale family, two religious orders of women were introduced into the United States, the Carmelite and the Visitation, Archbishop Leonard Neale having been instrumental in the establishment of the former in Baltimore, and the latter in Washington, D. C.[5]

Born on December 27, 1835, in her grandfather's home, a stone's throw from the White House, Adele spent a happy childhood, sharing her joys with her younger brother whom she affectionately called "Maddy." An only daughter, Adele, was the close companion of her beautiful and brilliant mother, besides spending much of her time until her fifteenth year with her grand-aunt Madison who, after her illustrious husband's death, took up her home in the Cutts house which then belonged to her. Here Dolly held a court as brilliant as any ever presided over by an American woman, and Adele was early familiarized with the greatness of a generation that was already passing away, among them Webster, Clay, Calhoun, as well as every President of the United States who was in office during the residence in Washington of her charming Aunt Dolly to whom they paid the tribute of frequent visits.[6] Here she held public receptions—a laboratory where Adele had ample practice in acquiring the social graces that so distinguished her later life.

Adele's education at the Academy of the Visitation, Georgetown, was conducive to the further training of her character, already beautiful by nature and developing amid happy surroundings in her home.[7]

[3] Virginia T. Peacock, *Famous American Belles of the Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1901), p. 177.

[4] Alice Norris Parran, *Register of Maryland's Heraldic Families* (Baltimore, 1935). Cf. also, Hester Dorsey Richardson, *Side-Lights on Maryland History* (Baltimore, 1913).

[5] M. C. Jenkins, "The Most Reverend Leonard Neale," in *United States Catholic Magazine and Monthly Review*, III (August, 1844), 505-12.

[6] Peacock, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

[7] The records of Visitation Academy for this period are inadequate, but Adele Cutts is listed as having attended the Academy in 1843, and, in 1848, she wrote from the Academy to her Aunt Dolly. The account of the centenary celebration

Franklin Pierce was inaugurated March 4, 1853. In that year, Miss Cutts reached her eighteenth birthday and took her place in the social life of the nation's capital as a member of the circle of belles who formed a great attraction at the receptions and balls of Washington. While she derived in the early stages of her social career some prestige from her connection with one of the illustrious families not only of Virginia, but of the entire country, she attained while yet a very young woman a pre-eminence by reason of her beauty, her distinguished bearing, and a genuine loveliness of character, which reflected as much honor upon the somewhat remote relationship as it had bestowed upon her.[8]

Indisputably the belle of Washington society, in the days when the capital still boasted of a genuine aristocracy of gentleness, grace, and talent; beautiful, sincere, sunny-tempered, generous, and warm-hearted; universally loved and admired[9]—such was Adele when she made the acquaintance of Douglas, an unromantic widower "who preferred the society of men, was none too careful in his dress and personal habits, and was convivial beyond even the custom of the day."[10] There are differences of opinion as to the circumstances of their meeting. A newspaper account attributed it to Senator Bright, at whose home Adele met Douglas, and at whose suggestion Douglas became interested in Adele.[11] A contemporary claimed that it was at a White House reception that the meeting took place early in the fall of 1856; she described his courtship as follows:

> Douglas, who was reputed to have had wonderfully magnetic powers and carried his audience with him, at the end of a few months of ardent and eloquent debate, with an audience consisting of one young girl, completely carried her away with him. A widower with two sons, like many a less fortunate man, he was instantly impressed with her absolute loveliness. He would go to her direct from the Senate chamber while the whole city was ringing with the fame of his speeches, which she not infrequently heard from a place in the gallery, and throw all his irresistible eloquence into his courtship of her.[12]

The marriage took place on Thanksgiving Day, November 20, 1856, in the presence of Father John B. Byrne, an assistant at St. Matthew's

---

of the Academy in the *Evening Star*, May 27, 1899, states that she was "one of the most beautiful girls ever in the school."

[8] Peacock, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-76.

[9] Allen Johnson, *Stephen A. Douglas* (New York, 1908), p. 316.

[10] Johnson, "Douglas," *Dictionary of American Biography*, V, 401.

[11] New York *Evening Post*, November 21, 1856.

[12] Peacock, *op. cit.*, p. 181.

Church.[13] General Shields, who was the best man, made a remark in a letter concerning the bride which the future fully justified:

> The bride, Miss Cutts, is a splendid person and will be a great benefit to Judge Douglas. She has good sense, exquisite taste, and a kind, generous disposition. Her influence will improve his appearance and soften his manners.[14]

Their wedding trip took them to Chicago. Already known to the South and the East, Adele's fame now spread westward. When it was rumored that Douglas was bringing her to Chicago, the people prepared to receive her with characteristic enthusiasm which she inspired in them then primarily as the young wife of Stephen A. Douglas. She made her first appearance among them at St. Mary's Church, where many people who had never been in a Catholic church before were found in the congregation that Sunday morning, and far more than the ordinary external contingent waited patiently on the sidewalk to see her as she came out.[15]

Christmas found Adele and Douglas back in Washington. Douglas established Adele as mistress of his spacious and beautifully-furnished house at the corner of New Jersey Avenue and I Street, one of the notable residences of the time. The home, with its elegantly furnished parlors and steam-heated greenhouse, was a suitable background for the loveliness of his young bride. With her favorite japonicas in her hair Adele, as a charming hostess, presided over the many levees which were thronged by the fashionable company of the capital.[16] In fact, it was not long until the Douglas home had the reputation of being a social White House, and it was difficult to determine whether the genius of the husband or the beauty of the wife attracted the greater homage.[17]

Within a year of their marriage, Adele's influence on Douglas became evident. This influence she exerted unpretentiously, perhaps even unconsciously, but none the less effectively. Johnson sums it up as follows:

> This alliance meant much to Douglas. Since the death of his first wife, he had grown careless in his dress and bearing, too little regardful of conventionalities. He had sought by preference the society of men, and had lost those external marks of good breeding which companionship with gentlewomen had given him. Insensibly he had fallen a prey to a certain harshness and bitterness of temper, which was foreign to his nature; and he had become reckless, so men said, because of defeated ambition. But now, yielding to the warmth of tender domesticity, the true nature of the man

[13] New York *Evening Post*, November 21, 1856. Cf. also, *New York Herald*, November 21, 1856.

[14] *Collections of the Minnesota Historical Society* (St. Paul, 1915), XV, 720.

[15] Peacock, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

[16] Margaret Leech, *Reveille in Washington* (New York, 1941), p. 18.

[17] *Harper's Weekly*, I (December 26, 1857), 818.

asserted itself. He grew, perhaps not less ambitious, but more sensible of the obligations which leadership imposed.[18]

The "Great Partnership" was proving a successful and happy one in every respect. Gentle, tender, and loving, Adele was most attentive to her "Little Giant." During his very long speeches in the Senate on the Lecompton Constitution, the Kansas-Nebraska Act, and popular sovereignty, she listened in the gallery, and, when he left the senate chamber dripping with perspiration, Adele was waiting to wrap his overcoat around him, to amuse, and to revive him with the sufficient amount of political lingo she had imbibed to do so.[19]

Adele accompanied Douglas on all his campaign speeches throughout Illinois and was of much influence and assistance; her role was, however, a distinctly feminine one. With characteristic selflessness, she submitted cheerfully to the discomfitures of travel, the inconveniences of country taverns, the irregular hours of sleep and meals, and made it her constant care to lessen the labors of Douglas and alleviate his hardships as much as possible. At every stopping, she joined the Democratic women as one of them and took cordial part in all they did.[20] In the opinion of many, her attractive presence was very helpful to Judge Douglas, as it was apparent that the "Republicans considered her a dangerous element."[21] Viewed from another angle, however, her presence was ominous for the cause of Douglas, as is indicated in the following:

> . . . . Worse still, she was a Roman Catholic, then a term of terror to most Protestants, especially in the rural districts. Douglas must be a Catholic, too, the Republican press had suggested soon after the wedding. Protestant ministers had not forgiven Douglas—never would forgive him—for his attacks upon them and the Know-Nothings four years earlier, and they were now an untiring force against him.[22]

The Douglas home in Washington was but two blocks from the site of the new St. Aloysius Church, the erection of which was begun in June, 1857, and completed two years later. Above the main altar in the church is a painting of the First Communion of St. Aloysius executed by the artist Brumidi whose monumental work adorns the Capitol. In this painting, among other characters, is depicted the saint's mother, for whom,

[18] Johnson, *Stephen A. Douglas,* pp. 317-18.

[19] Mrs. Roger A. Pryor, *Reminiscences of Peace and War* (New York, 1904), pp. 68-69.

[20] Frank E. Stevens, "Life of Stephen Arnold Douglas," *Journal of the Illinois Historical Society,* XVI (October, 1923-January, 1924), 650-51.

[21] William H. Herndon and Jesse W. Weik, *Abraham Lincoln* (New York, 1892), II, 103-4.

[22] Albert J. Beveridge, *Abraham Lincoln, 1809-1858* (Boston, 1928), II, 639.

according to an established tradition, Brumidi used Adele as a model.[23] An entry in the diary of the parish notes that "Senator Douglas and family since the opening of our Church have been among our best friends."[24]

Douglas' two sons, Robert and Stephen, by his previous marriage with Martha Martin of Rockingham County, North Carolina, who died in 1853, found in Adele a "true mother."[25] As such, she had not only their temporal welfare at heart, but also their spiritual, and it was a matter of much concern to her that, up to this time, the boys, then ten and eight years of age, had not received proper religious instruction. She took the matter up with Douglas, explaining tactfully that, while she had no desire to interfere with the religion of his two sons whose mother was a Baptist, yet she did feel that they should have some religious instruction, and advised him to ask a relative or friend to provide for it. Douglas, nominally a Congregationalist, agreed with Adele that the religious training of the boys had been neglected, and stated that he wanted her to take charge herself and have them instructed in her own religion. Adele acted promptly, and considered the matter of a Catholic school for them.[26] The following excerpt from the diary of St. Aloysius Parish gives the interesting circumstances of the decision to send them to Gonzaga Seminary:

> Fr. Maguire, accompanied by Fr. Rector, visited Mrs. Slidell, wife of one of the aspirants to the White House, and then Mr. and Mrs. Douglas, who had just returned to Washington. They look bright and hearty. During our call Mrs. D. observed that she must send her sons (step-sons) to some school and intimated her preference for the school at S. Matthew's which is classical. Fr. Maguire spoke of the Seminary (Gonzaga College) upon which the Madam poured forth little praise on the Seminary which she had tried. After her "Oratio in Seminarium" Fr. Maguire pointed to Fr. Rector and said: "Behold the President!" Mrs. D. stood it well and said she had already spoken. Still after a few words, she determined to send Robert and Stephen to us.[27]

Both boys completed the course at Gonzaga and then continued their studies at Georgetown University. Robert was the medal man of his class, finish-

[23] Statement of the Reverend Thomas A. Becker, S.J., Assistant at St. Aloysius Church, Washington, D. C. Cf. also, *Washington Evening Star*, January 27, 1899. George Fort Milton, *The Eve of Conflict* (Boston, 1934), p. 258, quoting Stevens, states that Adele sat for her portrait to the second Benjamin West. However, Stevens cites William W. Hoppin, "The Peace Conference of 1861," pp. 6-7, which states that it was a "portrait of the beautiful Mrs. Cutts"—no doubt, Adele's mother.

[24] June 7, 1861.

[25] Johnson, *Stephen A. Douglas*, p. 317.

[26] Letter from Robert D. Douglas, Attorney at Law, Greensboro, North Carolina, January 25, 1944, to the writer.

[27] January 11, 1859.

ing in 1867 with an A.B. degree and an A.M. in 1870.[28] In his early manhood, he made his home in North Carolina, became a "close and dear friend" of the future Cardinal Gibbons, then Vicar Apostolic of North Carolina, assisting him in planting the faith in that state, which at the time had less than a thousand Catholics. He was outstanding in religious, social, civic, and legal circles, ultimately becoming associate justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina.[29] Every living member of the Douglas family today is a practical Catholic, and, that they recognize Adele's instrumentality in their possession of the faith, is verified in the following statement of a granddaughter of Douglas: "I knew Adele in my early life, and loved her, and like to remember that all my family owe our Faith to her."[30]

Adele was conversant not only with Douglas' political affairs, but she had a lively interest also in his business matters, as is suggested in the following:

> Mrs. Douglas rapped at her window as Frs. Rector and Sestini were passing the house and ran out to invite us to enter. She complained that we were selling our land too cheap (at .25 per foot) as it had depreciated the other land thereabouts. Hon. Stephen A. Douglas was taking a nap when we went in; but Mrs. D. ordered the servant to wake him as it would not hurt him. He came in looking drowsy but still being very polite; for on (our) leaving the house he accompanied us to the door. During the conversation Fr. Rector told him that he ought to erect buildings on his vacant lots! "But," quoth he, "I am not able." "But you have friends who are business men?" To this he said nothing that is remembered. He said that he had been offered .30 per foot and refused it for his lots.[31]

When the new pews were erected in the church, Judge Douglas was listed for the first, "No. 1 at $80 per an."[32]

On September 30, 1859, Adele gave birth to a daughter. Her condition was so precarious for the next six weeks, during which she suffered with puerperal fever, that several times the physicians were apprehensive as to her recovery. The baby was baptized Ellen on October 18 by Father B. A. Maguire, S.J.; the sponsors were the Right Reverend James Duggan, Bishop of Chicago, an intimate friend of the Douglas', and Adele's mother.[33] Baby Ellen, however, despite the loving care and attention bestowed on her, enriched the Douglas home but for a fleeting two and a half months, and then her precious soul returned to its Creator. During

[28] Coleman Nevils, S.J., *Miniatures of Georgetown* (Washington, 1934), p. 181.

[29] Letter of Mrs. Madeleine D. Myers, Greenville, North Carolina, January 14, 1944, to the writer.

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] Excerpt from a House Diary of St. Aloysius Parish, April 4, 1859.

[32] *Ibid.*, May 3, 1859.

[33] Baptismal Record, St. Aloysius Church, Washington, D. C.

Adele's illness, Douglas relinquished his personal attention to politics, cancelled all conferences, and remained at her bedside, taking time to send his lieutenants a few necessary instructions.[34]

An excerpt in the diary of St. Aloysius Parish indicates that the Douglas' maintained cordial and intimate relations with Father Stonestreet, rector of the church:

> Fr. Rector, in returning this evening from Church, was led into Judge Douglas's house by his father-in-law, Mr. Cutts; after sitting awhile, Fr. Rector arose to depart, but Mrs. D. took his hat from him. Judge D. invited him to go to the Fair with them. The Judge, whose eye is on the White House, told him how Mr. Buchanan, now Pres. of the U. S., was the greatest old cheat in the country; he pledged to give, says Douglas, the same office at the same time to 5 (five) different persons & only one could have it.[35]

Early spring of 1860, found the usual conjecturings, campaign plans, convention preparations, and presidential pre-election rumblings that occur with undeviating regularity every four years. For Adele, it meant experiencing another campaign with Douglas, this time a more formidable one since he was the Northern Democratic presidential nominee. In late summer, the Douglas' decided to make their home in Chicago for a year, and rented their Washington residence to St. Aloysius Parish as a temporary parish school for girls.[36] The annual rental was to be $400, but, according to some accounts, there was ultimately no charge.[37]

Before the campaign was formally launched, some of Douglas' friends and political supporters told him that they thought it would be a wise political move for him to withdraw his sons from Gonzaga Seminary, at least during the campaign. Douglas replied that, while he wanted the presidency more than he wanted any other earthly thing, to withdraw his boys from a Catholic school for political reasons would be "a surrender to prejudice which was too great a price to pay even for the presidency." The boys remained at Gonzaga.[38]

The results of the election brought the presidency to Lincoln. Douglas was one of the first to call on him upon his arrival in Washington near the close of February, 1861.[39] Mrs. Lincoln's reception in Washington as the

[34] Milton, *op. cit.*, pp. 390-91.

[35] April 20, 1860.

[36] Excerpt from House Diary of St. Aloysius Church, September 10, 1860.

[37] *Diamond Jubilee of St. Aloysius Church* (Washington, 1934), p. 20.

[38] Letter of Mr. R. D. Douglas, Greensboro, North Carolina, January 25, 1944, to the writer.

[39] Esther V. Cushman, "Douglas the Loyal," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, XXIII (April, 1930-January, 1931), 163-70. The text of MS record of Governor James A. Pollock of Pennsylvania in the Lincoln-Douglas interview appears here.

First Lady threatened to be a somewhat cool one, but Adele precluded that possibility by promptly calling on her on the day of her arrival. Such was Adele's social presige in the nation's capital that, following her gracious act, almost everyone of the opposition, social or political, called upon Mrs. Lincoln.[40] The inauguration ball was a complete success. The President appeared leaning on the arm of Vice-President Hamlin and Senator Anthony of Rhode Island. Following the President was a couple "the sight of whom was singular and yet eminently gratifying"—Mrs. Lincoln and Stephen A. Douglas.[41] Deeming her presence at the ball a violation of the Lenten spirit, Adele did not go, but sent Douglas; thus it was that he escorted Mrs. Lincoln and danced with her many dances after the President's early departure.[42]

Lincoln, upon his assumption of the responsibility of the presidency, was faced with the problem of preserving the Union, maintaining the government, and defending the federal capital. In order to secure the support of the Northwest so important to the Union, he decided that Douglas' presence in the West was necessary. Adele and Douglas left Washington immediately, and, with indefatigable energy, Douglas gave stirring speeches at every stop.

May 1 found the Douglas' at the Tremont House in Chicago, with Douglas suffering from an attack of inflammatory rheumatism, which, despite prompt medical attention, developed rapidly into a typhoid condition which would not yield to treatment. By the middle of the month, Adele, considerably perturbed, sent to Washington for Dr. Thomas Miller, Douglas' personal physician; he arrived on May 27, accompanied by Adele's mother and younger brother, James Madison Cutts. Douglas' condition was so serious, however, that there was nothing medical skill could do. In his waking moments, he was occupied with national affairs and the conflict then being waged; "the salvation of the Republic was uppermost in his thoughts day and night."[43] The following Sunday, Douglas sank rapidly, and, Adele, realizing that death was close at hand, called in Bishop Duggan to visit the patient.[44] The next morning it was clear that he was dying,

[40] David Rankin Barbee, "One Day in Lincoln's Life," *The Washington Post Magazine,* February 11, 1934.

[41] New York *Times,* March 6, 1861.

[42] Barbee, *loc. cit.*

[43] Chicago *Tribune,* June 4, 1861.

[44] William J. Onahan, "Catholic Progress in Chicago," *Illinois Catholic Historical Review,* I (October, 1918), 176-183, asserts that Douglas was received into the Church by Bishop Duggan on this occasion; but Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J., "Chicago's Catholic Century of Progress," the *Catholic World,* CXXXVII (June, 1933), 459, stated that after careful research there was no conclusive evidence that this was so.

and, delicately attentive to the end, Adele asked if he had any message for his mother, sister, and the two boys. He responded with an effort: "Tell them to obey the laws and support the Constitution of the United States." A few minutes after nine, his earthly life came to a close; it was June 3, 1861.[45]

There was a universal expression of grief. Word came from Washington that "the illustrious dead belonged to the nation and should be buried in Washington." Adele, too, wished the interment to be in Washington. Illinois, however, felt otherwise. At a meeting of various committees consisting of the state and municipal authorities and others held the next morning in Chicago, a committee was appointed to present to the family of Judge Douglas the unanimous wish of the people of Illinois that his remains should be permitted to remain in Illinois. The delicate duty of communicating to the family the wishes of the committee was assigned to Colonel Richardson. In a touching interview with the colonel, Adele submitted, with her accustomed grace, "with pain but not with reluctance," to the wishes of the people of Illinois in appreciation of their spontaneous expression.[46] The funeral was held on Friday, the people of the city of Chicago having paid their respects to the remains for three days. Bishop Duggan delivered the oration, written from his notes by William J. Onahan.[47]

Douglas' generosity during his life had been characterized by such recklessness that he died practically a poor man. His friends began to solicit subscriptions for a fund to be presented to his widow. Adele, however, declined to accept it and petitioned that the sum thus raised be devoted to the erection of a monument to his memory.[48] His grave at 35th Street and Michigan Boulevard was located on his last unmortgaged property where he had hoped to build a home for his declining years. This property was acquired from Adele by the State of Illinois for $25,000. On it was built the magnificent monument, with the bronze figure of Adele's "Little Giant" at the top; at the base is written his last words to her: "Tell them to obey the laws and support the Constitution of the United States."[49]

Adele returned to Washington toward the end of June, 1861. There was some thought of making her home in Chicago, but apparently she decided to maintain her residence in the first home of her married life at New Jersey Avenue and I Street. She collected all of Douglas' papers and packed them in boxes to preserve for the two Douglas boys, then ten and

[45] Philadelphia *Press,* June 8, 1861, quoted in Milton, *op. cit.,* pp. 568-69.
[46] *National Intelligencer* (Washington, D. C.), June 6, 1861.
[47] Onahan, *op. cit.,* p. 177.
[48] Peacock, *op. cit.,* p. 186.
[49] Chicago *Times,* September 7, 1866, quoted in Milton, *op. cit.,* p. 569.

twelve years of age. The boxes she stored in the loft of a stable located at the rear of the house. Unfortunately, the stable burned and the papers were lost.[50]

For four years, Adele lived quietly, taking no part in the social world "whose magnet she had been for so many seasons."[51] Her dressmaker describes her as "one of the loveliest ladies I ever met," always dressed at this time in deep mourning with excellent taste.[52] She maintained an active interest in the parish affairs of St. Aloysius Church and donated $50 toward the furnishing of the new parish school.[53]

Adele was delicately compassionate in extending condolence to Mrs. Lincoln at the time of Lincoln's assassination. After Lincoln's burial, Mrs. Lincoln prepared to resume her residence in the West and insisted on having her dressmaker, Elizabeth Keckley, accompany her. Mrs. Keckley, however, was reluctant to go, as she had been engaged to make Adele's spring trousseau. Adele, learning that Mrs. Lincoln wished Elizabeth to go with her, sent the latter word: "Never mind me. Do all you can for Mrs. Lincoln. My heart's sympathy is with her."[54]

Early in the winter of 1865, just as the war was drawing to a close, Adele was the guest of honor at a dinner given by Miss Harris—the same Miss Harris who sat beside Lincoln in the box at the theatre on that fatal Good Friday night. Among the guests invited to meet Adele on this occasion was Captain, later General, Robert Williams, a graduate of West Point, one of the most handsome and gallant officers of the army, a native of Culpepper, Virginia, where his family had lived for several generations. His acceptance of the invitation was not due to the fact that he was in any way interested in meeting the guest of honor, about whom he had formed some preconceived notions that were none too flattering to Adele. She was already known to him by fame, and he presumed her to be a capricious "spoiled beauty," and had no desire to meet her, but he accepted the invitation of Miss Harris in view of the pleasure he hoped to enjoy from her hospitality rather than from meeting the guest of honor. On his presentation to Adele, the future general was astonished, nevertheless, to find himself so attracted by her gentle dignity and sweet simplicity, with nothing about her even remotely suggesting her awareness of a "fame that was as wide as her country;" and he found in her whom he had determined to avoid whatever pleasure he had hoped to enjoy otherwise.[55]

[50] Letter of Mr. R. D. Douglas, Greensboro, North Carolina, January 25, 1944, to the writer.

[51] Peacock, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

[52] Elizabeth Keckley, *Behind the Scenes* (New York, 1868), p. 90.

[53] Excerpt from House Diary of St. Aloysius Church, December 30, 1861.

[54] Keckley, *op. cit.*, pp. 209-10.

[55] Peacock, *op. cit.*, pp. 186-87.

After his first meeting with Adele, the future general attached himself to her with as much earnestness as that with which he had expected to shun her. His attachment ultimately resulted in Adele's becoming a bride again, and, on January 23, 1866, Father Daniel Lynch, S.J., of St. Aloysius Church, assisted at the nuptial ceremony at her home, the Douglas Place, in the presence of U. S. Grant and Gertrude Cutts, witnesses, and immediate friends of their respective families.[56] The following Saturday, Adele gave her first reception as Mrs. Williams. It was attended by most of the distinguished persons resident in or then visiting in Washington; among the latter were Archbishop Martin J. Spalding and Chief Justice Chase, as well as an attractive representation from Baltimore.[57]

With the birth of her son Robert, however, Adele relinquished her social queenship for the crown of motherhood which she wore with no less grace. Her marriage with General Williams, described as "an ideal love match,"[58] was blessed with six children; the three eldest, Robert, Ellen, and Philip, were baptized at St. Aloysius Church. The three youngest, Adele, James, and Mildred, were apparently born in the West, for General Williams was assigned to duty at various army posts there, and most of their married life was spent in that region.[59] The character of Adele showed at its best in the role of wife and mother, and the honors that came to the general in his military career were reflected in the peaceful joy of his home where Adele was queen.[60]

General Williams was assigned the office of assistant adjutant general about 1890, later succeeding General Miles as adjutant general; consequently, the family returned to Washington and made their home at 2001 P Street, N. W.[61] Adele's health, never robust, declined after the return of the family to Washington. She improved sufficiently, however, to take an active part in the wedding of her oldest daughter Ellen to Lieutenant Commander John B. Patton, U.S.N. Death claimed her shortly after, and, on Thursday evening, January 26, 1899, at six forty-five, her lovely life was terminated. She retained to the last the exquisite charm in conversation and manner, at all times her greatest attraction, which, with her beauty, had made her so popular in Washington society more than thirty years before. The funeral took place from Holy Trinity Church on Monday, January 30, 1899.[62] Both she and General Williams are buried at Arlington.

SISTER MARIE PERPETUA HAYES

St. Mary-of-the-Woods College

[56] *National Intelligencer* (Washington, D. C.), January 24, 1866. The marriage record at St. Aloysius Church gives the names of the witnesses.

[57] *Ibid.*, January 29, 1866.

[58] Washington *Evening Star*, January 27, 1899.

[59] Letter of Mr. R. D. Douglas, January 25, 1944, to the writer.

[60] Washington *Evening Star*, January 27, 1899.

[61] Douglas, *loc. cit.*

[62] Washington *Post*, January 29, 1899.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHURCH HISTORY

Cardinal of Spain. The Life and Strange Career of Alberoni. By Simon Harcourt-Smith. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1944. Pp. xiv, 282. $3.50.)

The story of Alberoni, who rose from obscurity to a position of high importance in European statecraft, is an intriguing one. This eminent cardinal and statesman, the son of a Parmesan gardener, was born in the latter half of the seventeenth century. After serving as a farm hand and bell-ringer, he was advanced to the priesthood by the bishop of his native Piacenza. Of an exceedingly gracious and captivating personality, Alberoni caught the attention of the Duc de Vendome, in command of the French troops in Italy. Accompanying this redoubtable soldier he gained entrance into the French court and was instrumental in setting the Bourbon on the Spanish throne as Philip V. After arranging the marriage of Philip with the Parmesan Elizabeth Farnese he attained a position of prime importance at the court of Spain. Due to royal pressure, Clement XI created him a cardinal in 1717. As prime minister Alberoni was responsible for many salutary and advanced measures of political economy. He corrected abuses and sought to restore Spain as a naval power. During his brief career as the supreme power in Spain he was caught in the meshes of political intrigues and schemes to maintain the balance of power in Europe. His downfall was eventually brought about by the Quadruple Alliance. In 1719 he was dismissed by Philip and spent his remaining years in his native Italy.

While the historian might question the over-all portrayal of the times and some of the very intimate details on personalities, he must concede that Harcourt-Smith has succeeded in giving a unique and concise account of the War of the Spanish Succession and of Alberoni's ultimate defeat by the Quadruple Alliance. Alberoni emerges from the account a broken hero, in so far as an ecclesiastical politician can be a hero. The author's treatment of the cardinal, as he himself confesses, is very sympathetic, but one is amazed at the ingenuousness of some reviewers who never once question the historical accuracy of some of his judgments and the veracity of many of his statements. Unfortunately, the book has almost no documentation, making it very difficult for the historian to check its sources. As a result one cannot ascertain certainty regarding the wealth of details and superficialities with which the author surrounds his narrative. How much of the reconstruction is due to his own imagination, to what extent is it colored by his own materialistic and pragmatic outlook? His too

great reliance upon travelogues, memoirs, salon writings, and the diaries of erotic women can hardly give a true impression of the times. He seems particularly adept at giving an unsavory, sexy twist to many incidents and at supplying intimate personal details, too often irrelevant, which the historian must distrust. The author writes with a very clever and facile pen and his style is definitely journalese. Yet there is a too obvious attempt to be startling and sensational.

Not understanding the inner significance of Catholic practices, Mr. Harcourt-Smith tends to look with disdain upon these things. It is hardly excusable to lampoon practices sacred to Catholics with cheap, sardonic remarks. "While the priests, like Tibetan lamas, tried by their chantings to exorcize the King's devils" (p. 34). Nevertheless, one must hesitate to accuse him of prejudice against Catholicism. It would seem nearer the truth to say that his attitude is distorted by modern liberalism. While the book has some things to recommend it, it is unsatisfactory for the serious historical scholar. It does, however, possess a very extensive bibliography and nineteen fine illustrations.

PAUL J. KNAPKE

St. Charles Seminary
Carthagena, Ohio

Father Theobald Mathew, Apostle of Temperance. By Patrick Rogers, M.A., D.Litt., Member of the Royal Irish Academy. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1945. Pp. xxiii, 166. $2.50.)

This edition of a recent study of Theobald Mathew, O.F.M.Cap. (Dublin, 1943), provides, quite fittingly, for a wide circulation of this sympathetic picture of the great Irish temperance leader in the United States where his priestly life and labors won for him in his own time a peculiar and universal esteem.

The early days at Thomastown Castle, Tipperary—his birth-place in 1790—the school years at St. Canice's Academy, Kilkenny, a brief stay at Maynooth, and finally, the Franciscan vocation and ordination to the priesthood in Dublin in 1813, are succinctly treated. Serving the Blackamoor Lane congregation in Cork for a quarter-century, the young friar was widely known as a preacher, confessor, and, above all, as an unfailing friend of the poor. His election in 1822 as minister provincial of the Irish Friars Minor, Capuchin, came as recognition of his singular merits, which his continuance in the same office for almost thirty years was to confirm. With the foundation of the Cork Total Abstinence Society in 1838, began the crusade with which Father Mathew's name is inseparably associated, and to his heroic exertions in this cause of moral reform, in Ireland, Scotland, England, and the United States, until his death in 1856, the remainder of the study is devoted.

An admirable objectivity in no way mars the charm of this moving life of universal appeal. Many will find timely interest in this early, perhaps premature, experiment in intercredal co-operation in social reform. An "Author's Note" with a brief notice on sources, historiography, and objectives, will especially interest historians (pp. v-viii).

The author is indebted, as all later writers must be, to the work of John F. Maguire, *Father Mathew: A Biography* (London, 1863), justly referred to as "a classic of its kind" (p. v). But here new light, as well as new life and form, are given to the nearly forgotten story.

Special interest in the American visit may reasonably be expected of this review. It should be stated, in fairness to the author, that an almost total dependence on Maguire was undoubtedly dictated by circumstances. The heuristic problem is readily appreciated. But the fact remains that the latter's deficiencies, so ably criticized by the author himself (p. v), are nowhere more real than in this section. The valiant friar had an enviable press for a Catholic priest in those days. These sources could supply disconcerting lacunae (e.g., pp. 129, 140), and, in general, make possible a more substantial treatment for this part, when the definitive life, envisioned by the author (p. vi), is finally written.

A *mise au point* in some particulars will suffice at present. Discussing the alleged forgery of Mathew's reply to a New York temperance society (pp. 125-126), no mention is made of the priest's letter to Mrs. Rathbone explaining that the published version of his reply, delivered orally, "used expressions which I never uttered." (cf. Maguire, *op. cit.*, p. 428). This makes "forgery" too simple a solution and too harsh a charge. Garrison's unfair exploitation of the Irish abolitionist address of 1842, which Mathew had signed, completely overshadows the real work of the Boston mission, of which it was not the most notable feature, and where it was not entirely true that "the total abstinence societies were vehemently abolitionist in sentiment" (p. 126). The Catholic societies were not, and Father Mathew retained support in non-Catholic temperance circles there as well.

A somewhat elusive "Governor Lumpkin" (p. 128), who revoked an invitation to Georgia, appears in reality to have been Joseph Lumpkin, chief justice of that state's supreme court, writing as president of a local temperance society, and not his brother Wilson, then ex-governor, in any case. This alters the complexion of the incident, while sparing Georgia's hospitality, if not the Lumpkins'. Mayor Woodhull is rendered 'Wodhull' (pp. 123, 124), as in Maguire. There are some quotations without reference (e.g., pp. 134, 135, 139). In the bibliography, the first edition of Maguire (the only one accessible to the reviewer) alone is indicated (*supra*); another seems to be described (pp. ii, 343); the third (London, 1865), is used throughout. (Cf. p. 7, note 1).

An interesting genealogical essay on the Mathew family, by the Most Reverend David Mathew, Auxiliary Bishop of Westminster, serves as an introduction. A foreword was contributed, quite appropriately, by the Very Reverend Father James, O.F.M.Cap., Father Mathew's present successor as minister provincial.

J. JOSEPH RYAN

St. John's Seminary
Brighton

Flame in the Wilderness: Life and Letters of Mother Angela Gillespie, C.S.C. 1824-1887. By Anna Shannon McAllister. [Centenary Chronicles of the Sisters of the Holy Cross, Volume VI.] (Paterson: St. Anthony Guild Press. 1944. Pp. xiv, 358. $3.50.)

In 1941 the Sisters of the Holy Cross celebrated the hundredth anniversary of the foundation of their congregation and in that year began the publication of the Centenary Chronicles. The present volume, the sixth in the series, is the biography of the superior who is justly regarded as the American foundress of the congregation. The sisters, the third branch of the association which had been established in France by Father Moreau and which included the auxiliary priests and the Brothers of St. Joseph, had been located in Bertrand, Michigan, for some years before Eliza Gillespie, the future Mother Angela, more or less by chance, came in contact with them. While stopping to call on her brother at Notre Dame, en route to Chicago to become a Sister of Mercy, she visited the convent at Bertrand and from this acquaintance grew her desire to request admission. From 1854, when she returned to the United States after her novitiate in France, she was the leading spirit in the community. Her talents were of the highest order and her work in the religious life was able, energetic, and varied. Her numerous interests and activities included the establishment of the community of Notre Dame, the development of St. Mary's College, the founding of schools and hospitals throughout the country, the compilation of a series of textbooks, and the promotion of the *Ave Maria*. Her labors during the Civil War were especially noteworthy. In response to the appeal for sister-nurses, she, with many others in the community, volunteered her services and her remarkable efficiency and success were recognizd when General Grant appointed her organizer and supervisor of the military hospitals in Kentucky, Illinois, and Tennessee. Much of her best effort in later years was expended in securing the approbation from Rome of the constitutions of the Sisters of the Holy Cross in this country. The approval, however, was not granted until after her death, in 1887.

In this same year, 1887, a memorial volume of Mother Angela was compiled but the present biography is the first extensive account of her

highly interesting and industrious life. The author, who has devoted much study to the careers of prominent Ohio women, as is evident in two earlier works, deserves credit for making it better known. She intended to relate the story in an easy, flowing narrative with an attractive literary quality. There is an abundance of graphic detail and a minimum of pious reflection, while the whole is set to a rapid tempo. With some exceptions, she has avoided subjectivism and exaggeration. There is evidence as well of a rather wide acquaintance with the background of the life and, because of the numerous contacts made by Mother Angela, there is mention of a surprising number of persons prominent in the religious and political worlds. From the acknowledgments at the beginning of the volume as well as from the references in the text, it seems that Mrs. McAllister approached a large number of original sources. The book would have had a more scholarly character had these received a methodical listing or discussion, as well as the secondary sources which were consulted. A few minor points may be mentioned: the typographical error on page 68, the incorrect date for the division of the Diocese of Vincennes (p. 151, n. 5), and the unusual spelling of "Ruillé." The volume has a foreword by Archbishop McNicholas of Cincinnati, seven appendices of letters, and an index of names.

ROBERT GORMAN

St. Mary-of-the-Woods College

MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

Andrea Barbarigo. Merchant of Venice, 1418-1449. By Frederic C. Lane. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXII, 1.] (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1944. Pp. 224, xiv. $2.25.)

Although Andrea Barbarigo probably started his public career at the age of nineteen in 1418 with the handicap of having only 200 ducats, he also had two advantages, derived from being born a Venetian noble. The state required that the merchant galleys take the sons of impoverished nobles as "bowmen of the quarterdeck" and it also permitted young noblemen to obtain legal training. His first experiences were thus obtained. By 1431 he had accumulated about 1600 ducats and had established relations with the banking family of Balbi and with the merchants, the Capello brothers. In 1439, he married Cristina Capello who brought a dowry of 4000 ducats. At his death in 1449 he left between ten and fifteen thousands as a legacy. He never commanded a merchant galley as his future brother-in-law, Alban Capello, did in 1435. He never formed a partnership. He remained an independent merchant, managing several voyages or commercial investments at a time, buying and selling various commodities in Acre, Constantinople, Valencia, Bruges, and London. His

practicality and energy appeared again and again, even if he were not always successful and if his methods were not always open and frank.

This very informative study is, however, more than an account of Andrea Barbarigo's activities in turning ducats into merchandise and that back to ducats. With great skill Professor Lane has not only used the account books of four generations of the Barbarigo family, well supplemented by letters and other contemporary sources; he has also shown the relation of Andrea's career to that of other merchants, to the restrictions imposed on, or to the mobility permitted by the Senate. Professor Lane has begun each chapter with a brief, adequate overview of practices; then he has given the concrete examples as found in the sources. In Chapter I, "Old Wealth and New," the overview is about "Commerce and the Ruling Class." The second division reveals the emphasis Andrea placed upon trade in contrast to other investments. He rented a slave and the house he lived in. It was not until the last years of his life that he invested some money in three slaves and in some land for a summer home. The third division pertains to the shift in investments. Almost immediately after his death his widow bought the house, and both through purchases and legacies real estate became an important part of the family estate in the second, third, and fourth generations. "Public Protection and Private Enterprise," and "Business Associates and Opportunities," are the subjects of Chapters II and III. The text is comparatively short, consisting of 136 pages, with four critical notes, totaling sixty-eight pages. The latter are a mine of information and contain such important statements as: ". . . I have not found, even for the sixteenth century, letters and account book covering the same transactions, the combination which has survived in fragmentary form for the study of the Soranzo brothers and more fully, in more easily used form, for the study of Andrea Barbarigo" (p. 150). "In view of the completeness of the double entry in all these examples, it is reasonable to conclude that double entry was well known and commonly used at Venice at the beginning of the fifteenth century" (p. 158). "What has been called Casanova's 'greatest innovation,' 'his totally new technique of closing the ledger,' is substantially the same as the technique followed by Andrea Barbarigo more than a hundred years earlier" (p. 172).

University of Illinois MARY LUCILLE SHAY

Sociology of the Renaissance. By Alfred von Martin. Translated from the German by W. L. Luetkens. [International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction Series.] (New York: Oxford University Press. 1944. Pp. x, 100. $2.50.)

This book takes for granted that the reader is acquainted with the great names and movements of the Renaissance in Italy; and not only with the

great names and movements, but also with the authorities in the field. As such, it is a study for the scholar and the advanced student. And that poses a seeming difficulty. One so intimate with the Renaissance will recognize a fairly familiar picture. He will know most of the generalizations: the role of entrepeneur, humanist, and woman; the marriage of wealth and intellect; the meaning of *virtù* and its ramifications; the birth of a new ethical outlook and the accommodation of the Church to bourgeois culture. And more of the same.

Wherein, then, lies its value? In this, that it presents a unified treatment of the sociological aspects of the Renaissance. It brings together in summary form conclusions that may be found separately in Burckhardt, Reuter, Sombart, *et al.* Not that Professor Martin is a "glue and scissor artist." Only a master of the subject could have so clearly revealed the social dynamic of the movement in its origin, its full tide, and its recession. One feels that the essence of that dynamic is here. He feels, also, that the master sketches with bold strokes; that, therefore, he should not be querulous if a statement does not fit every fact. For instance, his impulse is to question the absolute truth of this statement "To the knight such an attitude [running risks] had been an end in itself and the meaning of his existence;" or of this one: "Religious and moral values [in the high Renaissance] had almost ceased to be worth the paper they were written on in an age when economic, intellectual and esthetic ones alone counted." On the other hand, observations like these carry adhesive quality: "The *litterateur* is the adventurer of the spirit who has broken away from every kind of order;" "The triumph of the villa was the triumph of the humanist over the capitalist;" "The preconditions for the formation of the modern court were, in the economic field, the existence of great wealth, in the political field, the evolution of the absolute state, and in the social field, the decline of chivalry together with the urbanization of the aristocracy." Subject to the qualification that large statements will not always conform to detailed facts, this synthesis is a valuable contribution to the literature of the Italian Renaissance.

FREDERICK E. WELFLE

John Carroll University

MODERN HISTORY

Poland. Edited by Bernadotte E. Schmitt, Andrew MacLeish Distinguished Service Professor of Modern History in the University of Chicago. [United Nations Series, Robert J. Kerner, General Editor.] (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1945. Pp. xxi, 500. $5.00.)

This is undoubtedly the most ambitious publication on the history of Poland on this side of the Atlantic. It covers all its phases, reaching far

back even to prehistoric times, with the stress on the epoch between the two World Wars. The large volume is a composite work of many outstanding American and Polish scholars. Customarily, in such works the scale of scholarly attainments of the different articles is varied, but it is evident that, conforming to the general editor's foreword, all authors have striven to give "an honest, sincere and objective" picture of Poland. Some chapters are excellent. On the whole, the authors and editors have given us an authoritative, quite exhaustive, and one of the best of recently-published works on Poland, and that at a time when Poland has become one of the most important issues of the present war and the future peace.

In view of the events of the past few years, so tragically culminating at Yalta, the following statement of the editor of the volume, Professor Schmitt, in his preface seems rather strange: "Just what form Poland will assume after the war is, of course, uncertain. But clearly the German menace will be destroyed and the alliance of Russia apparently will be available, if the Poles desire it" (p. x).

A Polish-Russian *rapprochement* is an absolute condition of a durable peace. Well-known facts, restated in this volume, prove that Poles were prone to forget the past and to inaugurate a new peaceful era in their relations with Russia. They met with rebuffs. As conditions now stand, there is only one way for the Poles to form an alliance with Russia, and that is to submit completely to her dictates. The Poles did not submit to Hitler, and there is no doubt that they will never submit to Stalin. So it seems that the future holds only more tragedy for Poland, and the unhappy situation augurs no good for the future of the world.

Another statement in the book which seems unjustified to this reviewer is that of Professor Kridl: "Had the other fields of Polish public life, particularly the political and social, been maintained at the same high level as Polish literature, Poland today might not be the devastated country it is" (p. 310). It is almost certain that Hitler would have struck at Poland even if all her public life would have been maintained on the level of her literature of 1918-1939, which, according to Professor Kridl's own words, was "not epochal in character." The statement is also at variance with assertions of his co-authors. Moreover, this reviewer cannot agree with all of his opinions on contemporary Polish authors. His appraisal of Boy-Zelenski (p. 296) is, by all means, too favorable; the latter's influence cannot be considered other than detrimental to Polish public life. (Incidentally, Professor Kridl complained of poor re-writing of his article in a letter to the editor of *Tygodnik Polski*, New York, March 18, 1945.)

There are several other minor inaccuracies. The Polish army in France numbered more than 50,000 men, as given by Professor Schmitt (p. 74). General Weygand spoke of four divisions in February, 1919, (*Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, The Paris*

Peace Conference, 1919, Washington, 1943, IV, 120), but, according to Robert Machray, ultimately there were "four divisions and the elements of two more" (*Poland, 1914-1931*, London, n. d., p. 123). Waclaw Lipinski enumerates five divisions and some auxiliary troops (*Walka Zbrojna o Niepodleglość Polski, 1905-1918*, Warszawa, 1931, pp. 408-409). According to Professor Orvis, the peasants in Poland were emancipated by Prussia in 1823, and by Russia in 1864 (p. 62 n.). On the same subject Radwan states: "There (in Russian Poland) the enfranchisement was effected . . . approximately twenty years later than in the provinces annexed by Prussia" (p. 220).

The beginnings of the Academy of Fine Arts in Cracow reach into the early nineteenth century. This does not agree with a statement according to which that school was founded after 1918 (p. 269). The monument at West Point is of Kosciuszko, and not of Pulaski (p. 352). The prototype of Sienkiewicz's Zagloba was Piotrowski, not Pietrowski (p. 356). On page 369 we read that the first United States loan to Poland was made in 1919, and on page 370 the date is changed to 1920.

The statement that Wilson "was the first great American friend of Poland," and Hoover "was the second" (p. 368) is not accurate. What about John Dickinson who most strongly condemned the partitions of Poland in his writing; Jefferson and John Adams who also did the same in their mutual correspondence; Washington who professed sincere friendship for Poland; James Fenimore Cooper who founded a Polish-American Committee in Paris to help the victims of the November insurrection; Samuel Gridley Howe who suffered prison for the Polish cause; Paul Fitzsimmons Eve who fought for Poland in 1831, and many other famous Americans who sympathized with her during her dismemberment?

The bibliography contains many misspelled names of authors and titles, e.g., Kostrozewski instead of Kostrzewski (p. 467); Konsperynski instead of Konopczynski (p. 469). In some cases the accents in Polish words are observed, in others they are omitted. The index is not as complete as the work would demand.

But all the defects of the work are of secondary importance. The volume is a valuable addition to the bibliography on Poland and the editors and authors have performed their difficult task satisfactorily, to say the least. They have done good service to Poland at a time when she needs the friendship of all noble hearts.

MIECISLAUS HAIMAN

Archives and Museum of the
Polish Roman Catholic Union of America

Suleiman, The Magnificent (1520-1566). By Roger Bigelow Merriman, Gurney Professor of History and Political Science in Harvard. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1944. Pp. viii, 325. $3.25.)

This book takes the reviewer back fifteen years to the University of Illinois, where Professor Lybyer was conducting a seminar on the Near East. It is not surprising to note that Professor Merriman has found in Dr. Lybyer an efficient pilot. He had spent fifteen years at Roberts College in Constantinople where he became thoroughly acquainted with the involved history of that tempestuous region. A competent scholar such as Professor Merriman is recognized to be would necessarily want his manuscript read by professionals. That Dr. Lybyer was instrumental in guiding him safely to port is seen in the superb biography which he has written. One can hardly help moralizing: that the relationships between scholars is very much like that which exists between those self-sacrificing, lonely men in our many weather stations and the pilots, whom they help to reach their destination without mishap.

We usually study this colorful period of history with our eyes focused on the Big Three, viz., Henry VIII, Francis I, and Charles V. A more balanced study prompts scholars to do what the author has done here, include Suleiman as an important and indispensable contemporary. Practically all the letters, despatches, and memoirs of that period are teeming with references to the growing and menacing power of the Turks. The various popes of the period kept warning rulers of this great peril; it became almost a theme song in their letters to rulers. If the book has any lacunae, it is the failure to give adequate mention to the Papacy in its worries, anxieties, and efforts to stem the tide of the approaching storm. The popes went so far as to attempt to organize a mediaeval crusade against them. But they failed because Europe had already begun to show the beginnings of its modern make-up, national competition. Henry VIII replied to the Pope's plea by answering, "we have Turks at home far worse than those abroad."

Professor Merriman is to be especially commended for the unusual chapter he has on the various portraits that exist of Suleiman. It is an interesting study in the art of the period. There is an excellent critical bibliography which will be of inestimable service to students who intend working in this field. In addition to the general chapter on bibliography, there are bibliographies to each chapter. This was necessitated by the fact that the chapters vary so much in their content. There are two excellent maps of the period, strategically located at the beginning and at the end. In this way, the reader can conveniently make a comparative study of the evolution of the empire of Suleiman. Scattered through the volume are fine portraits of the originals mentioned in his chapter on

"Portraits of Suleiman." It is almost needless to note, that a scholar of his stature would have a helpful index.

EDWARD V. CARDINAL

St. Mary of the Lake Rectory
Chicago

The Leveller Tracts, 1647-1653. Edited by William Haller, Professor of English in Barnard, Columbia, and Fellow of Huntington Library, 1940-41; and Godfrey Davies, Member of the Research Staff, Huntington Library. (New York: Columbia University Press in co-operation with the Huntington Library and Art Gallery. 1944. Pp. vi, 481. $6.50.)

Painstaking research and expert reconstruction by such capable scholars as William Haller and Godfrey Davies are gradually illuminating many tantalizingly obscure features of the mid-seventeenth-century revolutionary era in English history. Not the least significant aspect of that turbulent and confused period was the part which popular discussion played. Zealous campaigners representing an astonishingly wide range of religious, social, and political views sought to enlist support for their respective programs or reforms largely through the medium of incessant streams of pamphlets, petitions, addresses, and similar forms of ephemeral literature. Particularly interesting and important were the writings of a group derisively dubbed the Levellers by their contemporary antagonists.

The Leveller movement was not primarily concerned with current conflicts over religious issues, though it did develop in the matrix of that body of vulgar Puritans who were generally inclined to favor toleration for all sects opposed to the establishment of an episcopal form of church government. Never very definite in its composition, it appears to have drawn its adherents exclusively from the ranks of less prosperous middle class Englishmen such as small tradesmen, artisans, and farmers. Due to this peculiar character of its personnel and to the desire of hostile forces to discredit its peremptory demands for reform, the group was frequently but falsely accused of striving to destroy differences of social position and even of property. Determined to capitalize on an unprecedented opportunity for liberalizing the constitution—notably in the direction of securing frequent meetings of Parliament and official recognition that Parliament was representative of equal political rights and not the rights of property only—spokesmen for the insurgents so forcefully urged the adoption of a platform of democratic radicalism that they attracted a sufficiently unified following to be discernible as a real political party. However, their demands for fundamental constitutional reform were considerably premature and the vast majority of politically conscious contemporary Englishmen viewed their proposals contemptuously as the vaporings

of irresponsible eccentrics or sought to suppress their publications as incendiary appeals to irremediable revolution. The embryonic party failed to achieve any of its objectives, but the array of manifestoes which it issued did outline with remarkable distinctness the course taken by reforming democratic thought and argument in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The acknowledged leader as well as the most prolific writer of the Leveller group was John Lilburne, "Freeborn John," a perfect type of radical agitator. Irrepressibly pugnacious in attacking prevailing abuses and demanding reform, he came into conflict at one time or another with practically every powerful political organization of the period—lords, commons, officers of the army, and council of state. In such pamphlets as *The Legall Fundamental Liberties of the People of England* he revealed himself as being little more than a querulous egoist defending his own flagrantly disregarded "rights," but insisting with a certain compelling sincerity that he was championing the cause of traditional liberties common to all Englishmen. Abandoned by his erstwhile allies in the army regiments, assailed by self-righteous sectarians for the alleged "ungodliness" of his associates, imprisoned and arraigned on charges of treason by the council, Lilburne courageously persisted in his pamphlet warfare and inspired others to follow his example until the movement was finally suppressed by Cromwell.

Several individual Leveller tracts have been previously reprinted and have long been available to students in quest of information about the history of the era. The editors' laudable purpose in preparing the present collection was to enable investigators to study the movement's successive stages of development in sequence and its gradually evolving program as a whole. Because of the large number of publications issued by the group and the repetitious contents of some of them, only the most representative items have been selected. Each tract is prefaced with a brief explanation of its significance and the archival deposit from which it was derived. In a detailed introductory essay the editors assert that "no more extraordinary body of material exists in the entire literature of politics." With proper qualifications this appraisal is admissible. Among English political philosophers the Levellers were the first to emphasize the innate right of every man to enjoy a minimum of political privilege and the obligation of government to protect individual rights.

Marquette University CLARENCE J. RYAN

The Popish Plot. By Sir John Pollock. (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co. 1944. Pp. xxv, 379. $5.00.)

This volume is but a slightly revised edition of the ingenious and much criticized *Popish Plot* first published in 1903. Undeterred by the opin-

ion of many historians that lies and perjuries, religious and political passion, and the possibly irrelevant mystery of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey's death obscured any likelihood of certainty about the plot, Pollock attempted a full explanation centering his answer around three questions Lord Acton considered fundamental: what was going on between the Duke of York's indiscreet secretary, Coleman, and Louis XIV's confessor, Father de la Chaise; how did the informer Titus Oakes get hold of the wrong story; and who murdered Godfrey.

The author establishes the fact that Coleman and his correspondents often expressed their dissatisfaction with the Catholic position in England, and that they discussed projects for the advancement of what they conceived to be the Catholic interest. But Pollock has to resort to conjecture about the aims and details of the plot. Coleman and his friends were neither skillful nor discreet and some of their designs involved treason. It is, therefore, surprising that so little is found even against them. Pollock's account of Oates' career is judicious but it does not give an adequate explanation of how a minor henchman like Oates could have been given even an inkling of the plot.

The death of Godfrey is the most contrived and most easily questioned section of Pollock's work. He establishes the fact that Godfrey's body was pierced by a sword after death. But he does not prove, as he sharply argues, that Godfrey was murdered by strangulation. Godfrey may have died a natural death or may have been a suicide, and thereafter his body became the victim of blackmailers, plotters, or provocateurs. Of course, it is possible that Godfrey was murdered. David Ogg in *England in the Reign of Charles II* (pp. 579-584), considers suicide a possibility in spite of Pollock's remark that after his article of October, 1906, "there could be no question of any sincere person who had studied the evidence maintaining that Godfrey had committed suicide" (p. x). The asperity of this remark is paralleled by a polemical attitude throughout the book. Pollock's thesis is that the Jesuits murdered Godfrey and he disposes of many difficulties in his way by raising questions about motive, probability, and evidence. But the same questions can be used to dispose of the points he attempts to establish. The thesis is ingeniously argued but it is less a study than an able and somewhat unscrupulous prosecution.

The last section is devoted to an account of the trials of the "conspirators" and an interesting and valuable account of contemporary trial practice. *The Popish Plot* has, as Andrew Lang wrote, the fascination of a detective story. But it is not adequately presented in the background of the bitter quarrels between Charles and Parliament. The author makes a valuable suggestion that in the atmosphere of informers and intriguers plots were bound to flourish and almost any random charge could be supported by some evidence. But he does not develop it sufficiently. Pol-

lock's partiality is seen in his refusal to accept criticism as given in good faith. He attributes criticism too easily to apologetic rather than scholarly motives. This attitude explains why after forty years he found so little to change in so vulnerable a work.

MATTHEW A. FITZSIMONS

University of Notre Dame

The Story of a Family through Eleven Centuries, a History of the Family of Gorges. By Raymond Gorges. (Boston: Privately Printed. 1944. Pp. xxiv, 289.)

This unusual genealogical chronicle is based on an unpublished manuscript on the Gorges family, compiled by the Reverend Frederick Brown, a nineteenth-century antiquarian who pursued a hobby with considerable ability, earnestness, and disinterestedness. Mr. Brown's researches are contained in two thick books of ruled blue letter-paper, all in his handwriting. He had access to parish registers and other documents which were then available but are now for the most part scattered or destroyed. Furthermore, he was in touch with relatives of the family whose childhood had been spent in the eighteenth century and whose information was an asset.

The author of the present volume, Raymond Gorges, died before seeing his work in print. He not merely published Mr. Brown's manuscript but he wisely utilized it as an invaluable reference study while carrying on his own independent and extensive investigations. His purpose was to tell the story of a distinguished family as simply as possible, in order to make it acceptable to those who are not students of genealogy. Wherever he caught a glimpse of human personality in the various documents he consulted, he tried to record it in order to give life to the written page, "to preserve, as it were, the fleeting fragrance of rosemary from an old garden." Every family portrait he could discover has been reproduced, as well as many photographs of places—a total of seventy-four arresting illustrations.

Ralph de Gorges, who flourished in the latter part of the eleventh century, is the first traceable member of the family which derived its territorial name from its fief of Gorges in lower Normandy. His name appears on nearly all the lists of those who fought at Hastings. Thomas de Gorges, lord of the Norman fief at the turn of the twelfth century, is the first proved ancestor of the redoubtable house of Gorges in England. Thereafter members of the family sided with King John of England against Philip Augustus, went on a crusade with Henry III, and invaded Scotland with Edward I. In the early thirteenth century, Thomas de Gorges became a canon of Wells Cathedral. During the Hundred Years' War, Sir Tibbot Gorges fought in France, sat in Parliament, was a commissioner

to collect subsidies for the war, and twice acted as sheriff of Somerset and Dorset. In the Tudor period, Sir Edward Gorges was appointed vice-admiral for Somerset under Henry VIII's scheme for enforcing the wrecking and piracy laws. Sir Edward's third son, Nicholas, did a little privateering and commanded a London contingent of eight ships that helped to rout the Spanish Armada. But perhaps the best known members of this vigorous, talented, and highly successful family were Sir Ferdinando Gorges, lord proprietor of Maine in the great colonizing era of the early seventeenth century, and his younger cousin, Colonel Thomas Gorges, deputy governor of the same American province. In our own day, Sir Howard Gorges served in the Transvaal under Lord Milner, while other members of the family rendered outstanding service to the crown in other parts of the far-flung British Commonwealth.

In a brief foreword to the volume, Dr. John Calvin Metcalf of the University of Virginia pays a well-deserved compliment to the author for the expertness with which he dramatized and humanized the characters in his lengthy narrative. This work, a labor of love by a descendant of a great family, is, at one and the same time, a superb example of the bookmaker's art, a triumph of patient and exact research, an excellent portrayal of one family's notable history, and a most fruitful and engaging contribution to British genealogy.

JOHN J. O'CONNOR

Washington, D. C.

The Influence of the Enlightenment on the Catholic Theory of Religious Education in France, 1750-1850. By Clarence Edward Elwell. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1944. Pp. x, 335. $3.50.)

Students interested in religious education, either from the point of view of its historical development or its objectives, content, and methods should read this scholarly work of Father Clarence Elwell, professor of education at Sisters College, Cleveland. It is his doctoral thesis, Volume 29 of the Harvard Studies in Education, published under the direction of the Graduate School of Education.

With carefully documented evidence, the author shows how the aims, content, and method of Catholic religious education were affected by the rationalist and empirical spirit of the French Enlightenment. He does this by showing how theories of knowledge and truth, stemming from Descartes' methodic doubt, brought about a purely naturalistic and autonomous system of ethics and religion that under the guise of Gallicanism gradually infiltrated the social, political, and economic life of France. It is interesting to note that Father Elwell feels that the "changes which took place in the administration of education were partly the result of the Enlightenment, but more the result of Gallicanism. The effect of the

Enlightenment in this matter was more direct, but the rôle of Gallicanism was more fundamental and profound, more universal and of earlier origin" (p. 302).

The study further indicates the unfortunate consequences to religious education which resulted from the disruption of the union between Church and State that existed before 1789. Religious education gradually and completely became separated from general education while the ecclesiastical supervision of instruction was destroyed. Moral education was claimed to be a function of the state while religious education was practically ignored by the same and left to the private interest of the individual, the family, or the Church. Inevitably, religious and moral education became identified through statism. The essence of religion began to be viewed as morality while supernatural religion was considered a species of theodicy, founded on reason, emotional feeling, and individual religious experience.

Father Elwell has produced a splendid piece of objective writing while balancing conflicting points of view. He has shown very clearly that there was not "any change in the Church's principle that religion should be the first and main object of all education, although there were great concessions to the demands for more stress on the secular subjects" (p. 301). Furthermore, with respect to the state's claim to be the natural teacher of morality: "there was no acquiescence on the part of the Church in the principle, it being consistently asserted that moral education was the domain of the Church" (p. 302).

The student of religious education who is interested in learning how the Church met the encroachments of rationalism and naturalism in this period will be well paid for his efforts by a careful study of this volume. For example, although revealed truths were never discarded or the method of authority denied, yet reason was given more recognition than had currently prevailed as a method in religious instruction. Some of the newer factors which resulted were:

> a greater use of reason, a greater use of sentiment, the separation of religious education, and, later, its partial reunion again with general education; the drastic reduction of indirect instruction by means of the liturgy; the unsuccessful attempts to render religious instruction more agreeable; the practical cessation of religious instruction by the home; the development of new methods to care for the needs of the adolescent and of youth; the growth of the apologetic method based on reason at the expense of the method of authority; greater mildness in discipline; and the increasing reliance on books as auxiliaries to religious instruction (p. 304).

TIMOTHY F. O'LEARY

The Catholic University of America

AMERICAN HISTORY

Ideas in America. By Howard Mumford Jones. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1944. Pp. xi, 304. $3.00.)

Beginning from the postulate that "we still lack a comprehensive and illuminating history of ideas, of morals, and of taste in the United States," Professor Jones offers in this volume some stimulating and constructive suggestions as to how the lacunae may be filled. He deplores the fact that we do not yet know enough about the intellectual and literary history of America to understand the "baffling process by which a transplanted European culture has been changed . . . into the unique American thing" (p. viii). His reasoned appeal for a more intensive cultivation of the history of American literature is marked by the wide and deep scholarship and graceful presentation which we are accustomed to expect in all his writings.

In his discussion of American literature as an instrument for cultural analysis, Professor Jones stresses the truth that literary style, *formaliter qua tale,* can be an index of the "sensibility" of a given epoch, and consequently an important reflection of the epoch's intellectual tone. He applies this yardstick in brilliant analyses of the colonial and early nineteenth-century American mind as revealed in the literary monuments.

Parrington and others have popularized the antithesis between an American "Classic" and "Romantic" period, the latter dating from approximately the time of the Jeffersonian supremacy. With this interpretation the author sharply disagrees. He insists on a continuity of the American Romantic spirit beginning from the Virginia of John Smith. Some of the best passages in this book are Professor Jones' documented illustrations of the essentially Romantic ethos of such Puritan writers as Jonathan Edwards.

The essay "The American Scholar Once More"—a reprint of the author's Phi Beta Kappa Address at Dartmouth in 1937—attains high seriousness and real eloquence. Catholics will agree with this powerful plea for a return to the liberal arts college. The most sparkling, perhaps, of these chapters is "New England Dilemma," presenting the shocking thesis that the distinctively New England tradition has been exhausted, to be merged in that of the United States. The polished wit and urbanity with which the point is developed will scarcely calm the sensibilities of the more intransigent Brahims of Beacon Street.

Professor Jones believes that our culture is essentially Protestant, beginning in dissent and retaining dissent as its chief characteristic for decades. He points to the failure [?] of either Anglican or "Catholic authoritarianism" decisively to influence American thought on the higher levels (p. 120). This is not a new proposition, and it would be interesting (and, indeed, rather necessary) to hear the Catholic response.

The volume is enthusiastically recommended to the student of American intellectual and literary history. The bibliographical notes are excellent and full, with stress on more recent works.

JOSEPH T. DURKIN

Georgetown University

East Florida as a British Province, 1763-1784. By Charles Loch Mowat. [University of California Publications in History, Volume 32.] (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1943. Pp. ix, 237. $2.00.)

This compact little volume has filled in another gap in the history of British colonization in North America. The work stands as a fitting companion monograph to that of Cecil Johnson, *British West Florida, 1763-1783* (New Haven, 1943). There was need of such a work, for while we had some books and many magazine articles concerning East Florida in this period, no good over-all history of the province was available. Dr. Mowat has given a general picture of the English regime there. The story is clearly written in 150 pages of text with more than forty pages of footnotes to prove how well he has examined the source material.

The East Florida colony was perhaps the weakest of those held by England on the eastern coast of the present United States. It really never had the full force of the English colonial system applied to it, since it had hardly been acquired before the flame of revolt in the northern colonies flared up, thus cutting off aid for East Florida from that quarter. East Florida never had the population of the other colonies nor the commercial promise of them. The American Revolution was behind the lack of trade and the commercial ennui there. Apart from the government officials and a very small number of plantation owners, most of whom never seemed to get down to the business of cultivating the land. Nevertheless, British officials were aware of the usefulness of this territory as a guard to the Gulf of Mexico and as an outpost to ward off enemy intrusion on the other colonies, and that alone seemed to justify the expenditures incurred by the British. Some over-sanguine individuals may have indulged the hope of future greatness and commercial growth for the colony. A number of glowing accounts, mostly in the nature of advertisements to attract settlers, indicated enthusiasm, but the years of the British regime never saw any fulfillment of the hopes and when Spain re-acquired the place, the English-speaking colonists moved out almost entirely, although a number of them stayed on in the northern reaches of the province. The growth of population during the years of the American Revolution was of an accidental nature, induced by the desire of many loyalist refugees from Georgia and the Carolinas to find a haven of safety, and not by any attractions in the province itself. This fact was not always kept in mind

by the undiscerning writers of earlier accounts who looked upon the growth as another evidence of the superiority of British over Spanish rule in the colony. It might be added, too, that the lower house of the legislature, the assembly, came into being in East Florida only after long years, although the circumstances of the times seemed to justify the delay.

Dr. Mowat gives a very lucid and readable account of the political regime. We get clear-cut notions of the administrations of Governor Grant and of Governor Tonyn, the first moving along rather peacefully, and the second involved in bitter governmental quarrels with influential members of the council. The economic history of the colony is fairly well done, too. But some of the social questions, the treatment of slaves, the reaction of the colonists to religious teaching, the practical efforts at education and the like, are dealt with only casually. This may not be the fault of the author since the documents may not be available, but it is something that needs to be told. Moreover, the incident of the expulsion of Father Casanovas from the Minorcan colony is unmentioned, and some Catholic readers, at least, would like to see a fuller explanation of how the British officials were justified in taking over Catholic Church property in St. Augustine on the grounds that it belonged to the Spanish crown and was surrendered in the treaty which gave the colony to England.

Likewise, the refusal of the British officials to allow the only Catholic priest in the colony, Father Pedro Camps, to correspond with his bishop in Santiago de Cuba is not quite accurately described by saying that the British recognized no foreign jurisdiction. Father Camps badly needed the holy oils to administer the sacrament of extreme unction. These oils were sent out by the bishop of a diocese. Under the provisions of the treaty by which England acquired Florida, freedom of religious worship was granted, and presumably, freedom to obtain what was necessary for that worship. This the British refused to allow, fearing treasonable correspondence. There was no question of jurisdiction in it. Incidentally, no communication of Father Camps pointed toward treason or anything like it. He was interested in the spiritual welfare of his flock and the administration of the sacrament of extreme unction is an important part of it.

Three valuable appendices are included in the volume. Dr. Mowat wisely relegated them to the rear, for their presence in the body of the work would have made the account less smooth, more disjointed. As it stands *East Florida as a British Province, 1763-1784,* makes pleasant reading and gives much information.

MICHAEL J. CURLEY

Mt. St. Alphonsus Seminary
Esopus, New York

The Atlas of Congressional Roll Calls. Volume I, *The Continental Congresses and the Congresses of the Confederation, 1777-1789.* Edited by Clifford L. Lord. (Cooperstown: New York State Historical Association, 1943. Pp. viii, 32, Maps.)

(Cooperstown: New York State Historical Association, 1943. Pp.

The Atlas of Congressional Roll Calls is certainly one of the most ambitious co-operative undertakings in the field of American history up to the present. Sponsored by the New Jersey State Planning Board and Columbia University, and prepared by the Historical Records Survey, the work on the *Atlas* has involved five years of efforts of hundreds of people, most of them identified with the Survey. At first the project was carried on in New York City and then transferred to New Jersey, but all the while it was under the competent direction of Dr. Clifford L. Lord of Columbia University and now director of the New York State Historical Association. To bring it to completion, covering the period from 1777 to 1937 inclusive, many major research projects were involved such as the determination of the exact limits of congressional districts of the various states after 1789, party affiliations of members of Congress, and the way each member voted on each measure and, whenever possible, the proposer of the bill. The series—to be completed in some forty-two volumes—is being published by the New York State Historical Association.

Students have realized for some time the value of representing the distribution of votes of Congress graphically in the study of controversial measures that became the subject of national legislation. The device was employed as early as 1894 by Professor Libby in his provocative *The Geographical Distribution of the Votes of the Thirteen States on the Federal Constitution, 1787-8;* it was later used also on a limited scale by Dr. Paullin in his *Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States* and by such other scholars as the late Professor Turner and Dr. Charles A. Beard. But the obstacles that have confronted the individual student in studying and presenting by this graphic method aspects of regionalism and sectionalism have been very formidable; for example, the seaboard versus the back-country, the Atlantic area versus the Mid-West, the North versus the South; also the conflicts between urban areas and rural areas, of capitalistic planters and poor-whites, and of commercial interests and manufacturing interests. Maps were simply not available and the preparation even of one map, comprehending all the states in the Union, such as would meet the critical standards of scholars, was no easy task. It might, in fact, involve an unexpected amount of investigation to insure its complete accuracy. Now this problem has been solved—thanks to the Survey and to the other agencies that have been concerned with the preparation and publication of the *Atlas.*

In the first volume of *The Atlas of Congressional Roll Calls,* now available, we have presented almost 1600 roll call maps covering the period of the Continental Congress from 1767—when the roll calls were included in the Journal—to 1789 when the Congress of the United States under the Articles of Confederation ended its labors. Here are graphically projected, for instance, the sharp division of interest between the northern commercial states and the southern agricultural states over such an issue as the opening of the Mississippi river and the way the states voted on the various measures affecting the Northwest territory. One is also forcibly reminded through one map (C 1511) that in the year 1787 America was so little committed to the doctrine of isolation that only one state delegation—that of New Jersey—opposed a motion to refer to the Secretary of Foreign Affairs a resolution in favor of forming "a confederacy with the powers of Europe now at war with the piratical states of Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis."

The enterprise, of magnificent proportions, if now carried to completion through publication, will give to countless generations of scholars concerned with American history an aid of almost unique importance. There are defects in the present volume that will doubtless be remedied in subsequent volumes as these appear: the summaries and the roll calls, printed in agate type, are difficult to use without a reading glass and not all the maps and roll calls are free of errors. Even so, Dr. Lord and his host of workers are to be congratulated on the high degree of accuracy achieved in an enterprise in connection with which perfect accuracy demands almost superhuman pains in checking and rechecking results.

LAWRENCE HENRY GIPSON

Lehigh University

Against the Current: The Life of Karl Heinzen. By Carl Wittke. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1945. Pp. x, 342. $3.75.)

This volume sketches the career and stresses the literary output of Karl Heinzen (1809-1880), German-born atheist, who settled in the United States in 1850, and spent most of his American career as newspaper editor in Boston.

Heinzen was born of Catholic parents near Düsseldorf. His schooling was marked by insubordination and failures. He was dismissed from the University of Bonn after his second year, and although he did some real work there in his first year, he may be classed as self-taught. For a bit over a year he tried soldiering in the Dutch foreign legion and as a Prussian conscript. He came out an embittered anti-militarist. Then for eight years he made a living as a tax official, hardly finding any contentment therein. Then came a book in which he indicted the Prussian bureaucracy and which started him on the road to exile. Belgium had

too many priests and soldiers for his taste and so he went to Switzerland where his idea of freedom made him undesirable to the government.

In 1847 he came to the United States for a brief time, but in the fall of 1850 he arrived to stay for good. Although he knew that his radicalism and unorthodoxy meant bankruptcy, he felt that it was his destiny to champion them. In his fight for atheism, skepticism, and materialism he was hopelessly handicapped by his use of sarcasm and poor taste, particularly when engaged with organized religion. His pet aversions were the church, monarchy, and communism. The general result of his life and work was frustration, contradiction, and enmity.

Heinzen advocated a surprisingly wide program in the social, political, and economic fields. For instance, he demanded equality for Negroes and women, and that the state guarantee the opportunity to work. He wanted the Monroe Doctrine extended to the world. According to him the structure of the federal government must be altered. There should be no longer a federation but one state with a government which would combine British and Swiss forms. To effect the change he organized a League of Radicals which had a limited membership and influence. The founder never mastered English and knew few American leaders. To some it may seem that Heinzen's state was totalitarian. Though it is admitted that he was socialistic, he has been charged with both communism and anarchism. Some find in him a defective thinking known as revolutionary abstractionism. In brief, Heinzen was a dealer in chimeras.

The volume is a major contribution to the literature about the immigrant Germans. It is first-rate because it exhibits a hero who had eyes and saw and who had ears and heard. Heinzen penetrated the fog of make-believe culture of the Germans, especially the Forty-eighters. His unmasking of Schurz and Wagner, among many others, may well be the verdict of history. This biography will stimulate probing into the entire question of German culture. Heinzen's idea of it is unsatisfactory and vague. He said that it was a combination of German intelligence and radical thinking.

Professor Wittke's work is well written. Although it depends too much on Heinzen as a source, it rests on a wide variety of reading. It is a superb example of marshalling facts according to German historiography, and on the other hand, it betrays some of the weakness of this in its presentation of the meaning behind the facts. Although Professor Wittke is aware of the importance of backgrounds and intellectual derivatives, he did not see fit to emphasize them in some instances. The volume is equipped with an index, bibliographical essay, and a few photographs.

PETER LEO JOHNSON

St. Francis Seminary
Milwaukee

Our Jungle Diplomacy. By William Franklin Sands, in collaboration with Joseph M. Lalley. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1944. Pp. 250. $2.50.)

It is unfortunate that a book like this, so full of the keen appreciations of a veteran diplomat, lacks the scholarly touch which would enable one to classify it as historical writing. Yet it remains a work vastly superior to the ordinary journalistic exposé, hence much more reliable, more valuable to the historian as a source, a work to be put beside the documentary record as a refreshing supplement.

Mr. Sands tells us that his connection with American diplomacy began in 1896. Of his earlier years in the service in the Orient, he has already published his *Undiplomatic Memories* (New York, 1930), and now he collaborates with a very competent journalist to discuss his years of "Canal Policy." Beginning in 1904, in Panama, he undertook the delicate task of reconciling the new government of that curious state to the establishment of one United States representative as both canal commissioner and minister. That out of the way, he proceeded to Guatemala to rescue Minister Joseph Lee from a poison plot which Dictator Estrada was promoting. Lee was shipped home to safety, and Sands developed empirically the answers to the problems of diplomacy in Central America; and he found oriental experience invaluable for an occasional hypothesis. Among other things, he soon discovered that the principal duty of the service, the protection of the interests of his fellow-citizens abroad, could be a most disgusting and unrewarding task, what with petty banking racketeers, soldiers of fortune, and fugitives from justice, all gravitating to an area where the prevailing social and political ethics made them feel at home. As he was to return to Guatemala as minister plenipotentiary, and as he was to remain there until the Department of State refused to support him on the issue of the Sulzer mining schemes, he has the most authoritative comments to make upon that particular country. However, it is in the chapter on Mexico, where he spent the interlude between the first and second trips to Guatemala, that he develops most extensively his interpretation of places and people. After his retirement from the diplomatic service—a retreat carried out with colors flying—he ventured as far south as Ecuador on behalf of a banking syndicate, and there he enjoyed perhaps the most blood-curdling days of his life. He describes with grim humor "the ritual of murder and rapine which has been part of every real revolution I have ever known or heard of" (p. 209).

Catholics will be interested in the chapter on Mexico, although it must be said that here Mr. Sands is not giving us so much a personal account of events—his was a relatively minor experience there—as an interpretation from the point of view of a diplomatic insider of the period. He might better have written a separate monograph, replete with scholarly para-

phernalia, for we need an authoritative treatment along these lines. Nevertheless, what we have here constitutes a most damaging refutation of the Liberal apologies for the revolution and the subsequent Wilsonian intervention. It gives us the clearest illustration of the meaning of the book's title. If Taft and Knox had no particular policy with regard to Mexico they at least had, in Ambassador David Thompson, one who had extraordinary influence with all factions in the country and, Sands believes, he might have averted the holocaust. But he was dismissed at the most critical juncture, and there followed nineteen years of "disastrous errors" in diplomacy. Thus, "American diplomacy is . . . a jungle through which each individual diplomat must cut his own course, and must depend on his own sense of direction, without stars or sun or compass to aid him" (p. 150). In regard to the Church in Mexico, Mr. Sands properly distinguishes between the anti-clericalism of the nineteenth century and the twentieth century war on religion itself. He believes that the Indian will ultimately turn on the mestizo to avenge political exploitation and to defend his religious heritage, and he sees in *Sinarquismo* the form of Indian democracy which will produce one more revolution, this the final act in the drama which began when the mestizo let loose the ageless xenophobia against the *gachupines*.

Mr. Sands believes that the Japanese have been instructed by the occasional bursts of American imperialism to follow their course of dominating East Asia: "To Korea the path was marked 'Hawaii,' to Manchuria it was marked 'Panama.'" The implication is not too clear when he suggests that we might better have followed our own worst policies than to have pursued the inconsistent "jungle policy" he dislikes. After all, why do we admire Reuben Clark, or Dwight Morrow, or William Franklin Sands?

JOHN T. FARRELL

The Catholic University of America

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Since the English-speaking Catholic world celebrates this October the centenary of the conversion of John Henry Cardinal Newman, it is worth while recalling that there was what might be called a branch of the Oxford movement in this country. There are several parallels between the English and the American movements, although the American converts to the faith lacked the brilliance of the English group. There is also some parallel between the characters of John Keble in the English movement and Arthur Carey in the American movement. That there was considerable correspondence between the English and American participants in the Oxford movement is shown in the extant letters in the James A. McMaster Collection in the archives of the University of Notre Dame. McMaster himself changed the spelling of his name and took a new first name after his conversion. He was known as Benjamin McMaster while a student in the Anglican seminary.

In the current discussions about Catholic Action and the participation of the laity in the work of the Church in America, quite too little attention has been given the exemplary conduct of several Catholic lay leaders during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. While the Catholic Congress movement was not peculiar to America, the Lay Catholic Congress of Baltimore in November, 1889, is probably the peak in the participation of the laity in American Catholic activities before 1900. Although the congress was watched over rather carefully by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, the leaders in the congress were chiefly Henry F. Brownson of Detroit, William J. Onahan of Chicago, and Henry J. Spaunhorst of St. Louis. In most of the congress activities of those days the point of discussion was the relation between the Church and science. Similar congresses, if held today, might find a fruitful field for activity in the study of the relationship between religion and politics. A congress, to discuss the recent Christmas message of Pope Pius XII on Christian democracy, would be fruitful for the participants and useful to the general American public.

Among the Talbot papers recently given to the archives of Georgetown University there is an interesting letter of Father Jean François Rivet, the missionary at Post Vincennes from 1795 to his death in 1804. The letter is dated November 26, 1796, and is written to the Secretary of War. At this time France was looking to the new world with ambitions of re-establishing her colonial empire which she had lost in 1763. Santo Domingo and Haiti, then Louisiana, and perhaps even more territory that had

formerly belonged to France were contained in this dream of colonial expansion. The dream faded with the failure of the French in Santo Domingo and Haiti, but in 1796 the American government felt some uneasiness about the loyalty of the French in the Mississippi valley. Rivet's letter testified to not only his worry about the existence of some unrest among the French in the valley, but also his own fidelity to his commission as missionary to the Indians of the Wabash and Illinois country from the government of the United States. As might be expected from the other letters of this saintly missionary, he was very careful of his obligations to his new country and its government.

Some of the dates given for the introduction of the Forty Hours Devotion into the United States seem much too recent, but the date of the actual introduction of the practice may never be definitely established. In this connection there is an interesting passage in a letter in the archives of the University of Notre Dame from Bishop John Carroll of Baltimore to Father Gabriel Richard of Detroit dated April 21, 1804. Carroll says, "I approve much of the days appointed for the 40 hours indulgence." While this is not the phrase now attached to the devotion, there is some reason for believing that the bishop was speaking of our present practice. He added that the practice of the "40 hours indulgence" was much in use in his former religious community, the Society of Jesus.

Following the adoption of a resolution of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association of April 22, 1943, a committee was appointed "to propose and to formulate in detail a series of projects in American history and culture and to report to the Executive Committee of the Association." Louis Pelzer was chairman of the committee of seven and their report is carried in the March, 1945, issue of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*. The committee recommended a closer co-operation with the American Association for State and Local History, the preparation and training of workers for historical societies, the preservation of newspaper materials, a constant vigilance over the teaching of American history on the part of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association with a view to its improvement, a study of the problem of printed materials for history and how to face the increasing difficulty of their physical expansion in libraries. Finally the committee urged that serious study be given to the question of popularizing history and making it more generally "welcome and useful on Main Street."

On May 4 the National Archives opened an exhibit of materials from the presidential papers of the late President Roosevelt dealing with the international scene. From the original and fourth drafts of the President's "fireside chat" of December 29, 1940, which launched his appeal for sup-

port in sending aid to the beleaguered democracies, the exhibit runs through a series of documents to the copy of the President's final address to Congress on March 1, 1945, following his return from the Yalta conference. Also on display are a number of gifts given President Roosevelt by heads of states during his travels to the international conferences of these years. On the evening of May 5 the Archivist of the United States was host to a group of guests who were shown the official Signal Corps films of the War Department on the conferences at Teheran, Quebec, and Yalta.

The annual report of the Rockefeller Foundation for 1944 reveals that a larger sum of money for the social sciences was made available than for any other field except public health. The amount for the social sciences was $2,193,000, while that for the humanities was $1,548,000. The sums allotted for the social sciences are not available for research projects of direct bearing on history. It is in the division of the humanities that history was served as, e.g., $25,000 to the Newberry Library and $20,000 to Western Reserve University for studies in middle western culture, $12,000 to Princeton University for its program in American civilization, and $16,000 to Michigan State College for studies in American and Canadian culture. The University of Oklahoma received $25,000 for preparation of materials on the history and life of the Southwest. Two biographical projects were aided. The University of Virginia received a grant of $21,000 for Dumas Malone's life of Thomas Jefferson, and the University of Toronto, $6,500 for Professor D. G. Creighton's life of Sir John A. Macdonald.

Attention of students of American Catholic history is called to the classified and critical bibliographical survey of literature in their field compiled by Thomas F. O'Connor, which appeared in the April issue of *The Americas* under the title, "Writings on United States Catholic History, 1944."

As we go to print the *Official Catholic Directory* for 1945 makes its appearance—the 113th annual issue of that publication (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons. $5.00, paper). It is the largest church directory ever published. Statistics on the three new dioceses in the United States are contained in the volume. With the transfer of the see of Concordia to Salina that diocese is now listed under Salina.

The Reverend George D. Mucahy, chancellor of the Diocese of Harrisburg, who is also diocesan chaplain of the Boy Scouts, has compiled a brochure entitled, *Treasure Hunts in Catholic History, Diocese of Harrisburg.* The diocese is covered by counties, and projects for fact-gathering by the Scouts on the Catholic history of their locality are outlined

and suggested. Through this medium a great deal of hidden historical data on the Church can be turned up, and these boys will learn to appreciate the Catholic past of their home areas.

Our readers will be curious to see the work of Professor Chiminelli on the history of Catholicism in the United States, which is reported to be nearing completion. Chiminelli, a convert to the Catholic Church, was a Methodist clergyman in the United States for twelve years. His history will appear in two large volumes in Italian. He has had access to the Vatican archives in his search for materials.

George H. Dunne, S.J., writing in the *Historical Bulletin* for May, 1945, on "Russia and World Peace," believes that co-operation with Russia is possible on international matters. Max Eastman and J. B. Powell present a contrary view in their article, "The Fate of the World Is at Stake in China," which appears in the June number of *Readers' Digest*.

A program of compulsory peacetime military training for the youth of the United States received hearings in a House Committee, June 4-16. Because of conscription's long and spotty record in other countries, historians as a group are vitally interested in this matter. The historical arguments, as well as others, against the system are ably presented in a pamphlet entitled "Conscription is not the American Way", written by the Faculty Study Group of John Carroll University, Cleveland. Frederick E. Welfle, S.J., one of the advisory editors of the REVIEW, acted as chairman of the group. The pamphlet can be secured from America Press at 20 cents.

The annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association was held at Queen's University, Kingston, May 23-25. Among the papers read were one by J. W. Pratt on "American Expansion and the Annexation of Canada" and one by Abbé Arthur Maheux on "Le Nationalisme canadien-français à l'aurore du XX^{e} siècle."

To commemorate the fourth centenary of the founding of the city, which will be observed in 1949, the municipal council of Baía, Brazil, for over two centuries the capital of Portuguese America, has made plans for the publication of a ten-volume work under the general title of *Evolucão Histórico da Cidade do Salvador* (Historical Evolution of the City of the Savior). Alfrâno Peixoto will write on religious history; Pedro Calmon, on sciences and letters; Artur Ramos, on the Negroes in Baía; José Vanderlei de Pinho, on military history; Luiz Viana Filho, on political history; Frederico Edelveiss, on economic history; Tales de Azevedo, on the Indians; Afonso Rui de Sousa, on social history; Godofredo

Filho, on the urban development of Baía; and Carlos Chiachio, on fine arts. The manuscripts are scheduled to be turned in to the committee in charge by 1946, and will be published in time for the centenary celebrations three years later.

James Ferguson King, University of California, has been appointed editor of *The Hispanic American Historical Review* in place of John Tate Lanning, Duke University, who resigned to devote himself to the study of the intellectual history of the Spanish-American colonies.

Work on the new edition of *Who's Who in Latin America,* the first edition of which was published by the Stanford University Press in 1935 by the late Percy Alvin Martin and by Manoel da S. S. Cardozo, now of The Catholic University of America, is progressing under the editorship of Ronald Hilton, Stanford University.

The School of Inter-American Affairs of the University of New Mexico joined with the University of Texas to sponsor a conference on February 24-25 at Albuquerque on the subject of Mexico's Role in International Intellectual Co-operation, the five papers of which have been issued in brochure form by the University of New Mexico Press (Albuquerque, 1945), and sell for 65¢.

The Reverend William J. Coleman, M.M., graduate student in history at The Catholic University of America, has recently left for Rome, via South America, where he will do research in the Vatican archives on the papacy and the independence of Latin America. The Reverend Antonine Tibesar, O.F.M., also a graduate student at the University, has already begun his historical investigations in the archives and libraries of Peru. He is especially interested in the history of the Franciscan *Colegio de Misiones* at Ocopa.

Robert C. Smith, formerly assistant director of the Hispanic Foundation and more recently keeper of the Archive of Hispanic Culture, Library of Congress, has resigned to accept a teaching post at Sweet Briar College, Virginia.

Alexander Marchant has been appointed publications officer of the United States Embassy in Rio de Janeiro, and has already arrived at his post.

The Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection of Harvard University, Washington, D. C., concluded its rich and varied series of lectures for this year on June 9. Under the efficient direction of Professor Albert

Mathias Friend, Jr., who has been in charge of research, a symposium on the decorations in the synagogues of Dura-Europus was held, April 26-28. Other lectures, mostly on art of the Near East, were given by Professors Friend, A. A. Vasiliev, E. K. Rand, S. der Nersessian—all scholars in residence at Dumbarton Oaks—Drs. R. Ettinghausen, E. Wind, and F. Saxl. In the meantime research by the scholars and fellows exploiting the collection has progressed steadily.

The next number of *Byzantion* is being dedicated to Professor A. A. Vasiliev. His long article on "The Life of St. Theodore of Edessa," which appeared in *Byzantion*, Vol. XVI, Fasc. 1, is a work of admirable erudition. With the Bollandist, Father P. Peeters, he classifies the *Life* as a hagiographic romance, but he succeeds in extracting much in the way of historical by-products from it. His study is the fruit of long years of interest in this particular account and problems akin to it.

It is good news for the historian to hear that the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* continued to appear through the war. We are informed that the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* and the *Theologische Revue* were published at least as late as 1943.

Zachary N. Brooke who has taught mediaeval history at Cambridge for thirty-five years, has been named professor of mediaeval history there, second to occupy the recently-founded chair. In his thoughtful inaugural lecture (*The Prospects of Medieval History*, New York, The Macmillan Company, 50¢) the distinguished scholar tries to find why the mediaeval field is being neglected at Cambridge and pleads that it should not be. He urges that the projects of preparing materials for English mediaeval history be perfected and completed. He asks experts in various aspects of mediaeval history to attempt occasional syntheses in their respective fields even at the risk of being somewhat ephemeral. There is need, he feels, of more emphasis on the human element, i.e., of good biographies.

The following titles among the historical dissertations completed in the universities of the United Kingdom during 1942 will be of special interest to our readers: "Bohemund I, Prince of Antioch" by Margaret P. Brennan (M.A., Belfast); "A Survey of the Ornaments of the Churches in the Diocese of Guildford, with a Historical Introduction to the Antiquities of the Churches in the Diocese" by C. K. Francis Brown (M.A., Leeds); "The Administration of the Estates of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, in the Fourteenth Century" by A. K. Babette Roberts (Ph.D., London); "The Organisation of a College of Secular Priests as Illustrated by the Records of the College of Holy Trinity, Arundel, 1380-1544" by R. B. K. Petch (M.A., London); "The Use of Plant Motives in Marginalia of

English Illuminated Manuscripts of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries" by Alice M. Houghton (M.A., Manchester); "The English Priories and Manors of the Abbey of Bec-Hellouin" by M. M. Morgan (D.Phil., Oxford); "Ralph Neville, Bishop of Chichester and Chancellor" by Miss J. M. B. Fradin (B.Litt., Oxford); "The Revival of Roman Catholicism in South Wales in the late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries" by Garfield J. J. Lynch (M.A., Cardiff). Copies of these theses can be consulted in the libraries of the universities at which they were presented. At Cambridge, Leeds, Oxford, and Reading only doctoral theses are deposited in the libraries.

Though the building of the Archives des Affaires Etrangères in Paris was burned during the war, the archives themselves are safe.

The American Irish Historical Society awarded its 1945 gold medal to Archbishop Francis J. Spellman "in recognition of his services to the Republic."

Stephen Bonsall, expert on Balkan Affairs, intimate friend of Colonel House, and party to many a closed-door Wilsonian conference at Paris, was awarded the Pulitzer prize in history for his diary of Versailles days, *Unfinished Business.* Russel Blaine Nye, member of the English department of Michigan State College, received the prize in biography for his *George Bancroft: Brahmin Rebel,* a full-dress account of our first major historian.

John T. Farrell, who assumed his duties as associate professor of American history in the Catholic University of America on July 2, has been appointed editor of the volume on Rhode Island equity materials which has been projected by the Committee on the Littleton-Griswold Fund of the American Historical Association, of which Professor Francis S. Philbrick of the University of Pennsylvania is chairman.

Aaron I. Abell, a member of the Executive Council of the American Catholic Historical Association, and for the past few years professor of American history in Nazareth College, Rochester, has been appointed to teach American history in the University of Notre Dame with the new semester opening this month. Dr. Abell's doctoral dissertation presented at Harvard University, has been published in the Harvard Historical Studies. It is entitled: *The Urban Impact on American Protestantism, 1865-1900* (Cambridge, 1943).

The Association extends its congratulations to Philip J. Furlong, principal of the Cardinal Hayes High School, New York, on his elevation to

the rank of a domestic prelate and to Thomas J. McMahon, national secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association, on his appointment as a papal chamberlain.

The April issue of the REVIEW was passing through the bindery when the shocking news came on April 12 telling of the death of President Roosevelt. The late President has been eulogized the world over as perhaps no other American has ever been. In his passing historians lost a good friend. Not only did he give every encouragement to the great work of the National Archives, opened during his first administration, but in 1941 he dedicated the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, which will in time house most of the materials relating to his unusually eventful life. He enjoyed working there on his collections of first editions, naval manuscripts, stamps, and prints. In the last days of March he visited the Library several times and he left his room piled everywhere with the books and pictures he loved. Few men in public life better appreciated the work of the historian than President Roosevelt, and in his death historians feel the loss of one who had an uncommon insight into the value of their labors.

Ernst Stein, distinguished Byzantine scholar, died in Switzerland this winter. Professor Stein taught Byzantine history at The Catholic University of America for a short period. He was connected with the Institute of Oriental Philology and History at Brussels when the war broke out.

Albert Ten Eyck Olmstead, professor of Oriental history at the University of Chicago, died, April 11, at the age of 65.

David Randall-MacIver, archaeologist, noted for his work in Egyptology, died in New York, April 30, at the age of seventy-one.

Gerardo Arrubla is dead. He was especially known in this country as the co-author of the standard history of Colombia, translated by J. Fred Rippy of the University of Chicago, and published by the University of North Carolina Press.

St. Mary's Church in Alexandria, Virginia, celebrated its sesquicentennial on May 20-22. The parish dates back to the interest of Colonel Fitzgerald in having Catholic services in Alexandria. Father John Thayer of Boston, was there in 1795 and in that year Father Francis Neale, brother of the future Archbishop Leonard Neale of Baltimore, assumed charge of the congregation and took care of it until 1818. The Jesuit Fathers from Georgetown administered the parish until 1891 when the diocesan clergy of Richmond took it over. Father Robert F. Beattie,

assistant pastor of St. Mary's, has gathered the data on the parish and it has been published in an attractive brochure entitled *One Hundred and Fifty Years for Christ, 1795-1945* (Alexandria, 1945). Other famous early priests who served in St. Mary's at different times were Anthony Kohlmann, S.J., Enoch Fenwick, S.J., John Grassi, S.J., and Joseph M. Finotti.

On May 6 the Religious of Holy Cross celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Holy Cross College at Washington, D. C. The Right Reverend Lawrence J. Shehan sketched the history of the College in his jubilee sermon. Holy Cross was the first community to build a house of studies at the new Catholic University of America.

Documents: Four letters, two of Bishop Henni to the board of directors of the Ludwigmissionsverein, and one by him to the Reverend Joseph Ferdinand Mueller, its business secretary, and a fourth addressed to the board by the Reverend Michael Heiss, rector of the seminary. Peter Leo Johnson, Ed., (*Salesianum,* Apr.).—Joseph Rosati, C.M., Apostolic Delegate to Haiti, 1842—Two letters to Bishop John Hughes. Thomas F. O'Connor, Ed. (*Americas,* Apr.).—The Banning of *SAB* in Cuba. (*Americas,* Jan.).

BRIEF NOTICES

ANDERSON, ROBERT GORDON. *The Biography of a Cathedral.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1944. Pp. xiv, 496. $4.00.) This story of Notre Dame—and much besides—was written by a journalist-historian who has a great love of the Church, France, and Notre Dame. All three loves are given ample space with the result that the building of Notre Dame is started only toward the end of the book. The work will have little interest for the archaeologist or professional historian. Scholars too readily deprecate popular history of this kind. To this reviewer the book merits a wide reading by the general reader and college student. For here is a mine of lore, much of which is missed by students in formal classes. The style is lively, colorful, and well-suited to awaken and stimulate interest in history.

Beginning with a description of Paris in 52 B.C., the author traces the high points in the city's history, the invasions, its conversion, the roles of St. Denis and St. Genevieve, and the early churches. With this thread of continuity he tries to fit in many facets of the Church's history: the life of our Lord, Stephen and Paul and Constantine, the councils of the Church, the four great doctors of the Church, St. Benedict and his monks, the liturgy and the Vulgate, Charles Martel and Charles the Great, Canossa, the Crusades, the University of Paris, Heloise and Abelard, and the communes and guilds. This is a rather extensive background for the building of a church and tends to make the story ramble considerably. But it is all part of "the pageant that led to Notre Dame" and should make fascinating history for the general reader.

Occasionally the author makes serious errors. Thus, it was Theodosius I who made Christianity the official state religion and not Constantine. Again, to say that "the feudal system started in 731 on the Champs de Mars" is solving rather quickly a problem that is still a subject of dispute among professional historians. (JAMES A. CORBETT)

BEATTY, RICHMOND CROOM (Ed.). *Journal of a Southern Student, 1846-48, with Letters of a Later Period.* By Giles J. Patterson. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press. 1944. Pp. 105. $1.75.) This small volume, with an introduction by Richmond Croom Beatty of Vanderbilt University and a short biographical sketch by Henry Nelson Snyder of Wofford College, is one of those rare gems that turn up from time to time in the book world to the delight of students both amateur and professional. Giles Patterson of sturdy up-country Carolina plantation stock entered the sophomore class of South Carolina College, now the University of South Carolina, at the age of eighteen in 1845, and continued his studies there until 1848. He left the college without a diploma. "He had passed his final examinations but, irritated because of certain grades, he refused with three class mates to deliver the oration then required of all graduating seniors." Eighty-six years later, in 1934, forty-three years after his death, the degree of B.A. was conferred by a university that had come to recognize his worth.

Like many school boys of all periods young Patterson undertook to keep a "sort of memorandum of daily occurrences and of my observations in my evening walks of whatever nature they may be, provided nevertheless that they may at some future day . . . afford me pleasure." Giles did not write for publication; he makes many observations and draws many conclusions on problems, personal and local, and in so doing he gives us a finely-etched portrait of a young southern gentleman to whom education and life in the college world of his day meant more than a social experience in pleasant environments with a guarantee of a better job after graduation. The *Journal* ends abruptly in 1847.

After leaving college Patterson first taught school and then went in for law. He lived a long, useful, and honorable life and was an outstanding citizen in upper South Carolina until his death in 1891. The second section of the book contains a number of letters written by the now successful gentleman and scholar to his nephew, Giles Wilson, a lad preparing for Wofford College. This reviewer recommends without qualification these letters as required reading to parents of this our day whose sons are in prep schools and high schools, for therein confused parents of 1945 would learn of the Spartan ideals that were laid down as the formulae for success before present-day electivism and neo-progressivism had sowed the weeds that have blossomed into the chaos and confusion now dominant in the education of youth. "In other words," (he writes in 1884) "you must be prepared in Latin, Greek, Algebra, Geometry, History and Antiquities. In Latin and Greek you should be thorough in the grounds, well-drilled in construction and read (in) Cicero's Orations, Sallust, Virgil and Horace, or their equivalents; also Xenophon's Anabasis and Homer in Greek. Also Tyler's History, ancient Geography, Algebra, Geometry and Antiquities. These branches should receive your undivided attention for the next year and if you apply yourself diligently to them you will be prepared to do yourself some credit if you go to college." The *Journal* and the letters are a delight to those who look back to glory, and an illumination to those who look forward in hope. (JOSEPH L. O'BRIEN)

BENARD, EDMOND DARVIL. *A Preface to Newman's Theology.* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. Pp. xv, 234. $2.25.) This book must be judged by the purpose that inspired its composition. Dr. Benard wisely avoided doing the trite and dull thing of listing all the points of theology touched on or developed at length by Cardinal Newman. His chief aim is clear: to prepare others for an intelligent understanding of Newman's writings, and to remove whatever suspicion that may linger in certain circles concerning Newman's complete orthodoxy. in this he has succeeded admirably.

The author goes about his task by first setting down four canons of interpretation and next by giving a brief analysis of the two works which for the most part occasioned the controversy about Newman's theological correctness, the *Essay on Development* and the *Grammar of Assent.* Lastly, he applies his canons of interpretation and proves that far from deserving to remain under the killing frost of suspicion, Cardinal Newman should be to us like the rays of a noon-day sun which warm our hearts while they light up our minds.

In successfully clearing Newman of all modernist charges, the author seems to have overlooked the importance of one which arises from Newman's pref-

erence for the psychological approach to the strictly theological method in use in all our manuals. It is here that the average reader may, unless duly warned, suspect Newman of employing the method of immanence in the same way as the modernists used the religious sense. By this the reviewer means that Newman, who was past-master in matters of human psychology, often proposes a point of revealed doctrine as something his readers should wish were true. But, of course, it never occurred to him to leave it at that and to have us conclude therefrom that the wish alone created its own object, and that consequently the essence of all religion consists in the awareness of such nobler aspirations of the soul. This is precisely what the modernists did, and there have been too many who, because of this special character of Newman's method, accused him of doing that very thing, instead of realizing that this was merely a rhetorical device, a *captio benevolentiae*, to induce his readers to follow along with him down through history to the very times of Christ and the apostles, there to discover with him the divinely revealed and objectively real fact in which these nobler aspirations and desires find their complete realization and their all-satisfying answer. The author's insistence time and again on Newman's objectivity in all matters touching dogma does, indeed, refute the charge that Newman was something of a disguised modernist, but the reviewer believes the refutation would be more cogent if it came in direct connection with this specific source of suspicion.

Father Benard's book is well-written, and its logical precision and keen analysis are worthy of the highest praise. Let us welcome it to our work-tables, or at least to our ready-to-hand books of reference. (LOUIS A. ARAND)

BLAU, JOSEPH LEON. *The Christian Interpretation of the Cabala in the Renaissance.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1944. Pp. viii, 167. $2.25.) This study gives us a useful perspective of the Renaissance humanists on their more gullible side. It portrays the efforts of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Christian humanists to make something of the jumble of pseudo-traditional and pseudo-mystical writings which are the cabala. The entire estimate of causes, trends, and consequence is judiciously done; the authors to be examined in detail are carefully selected, and a substantial bibliography of the subject is provided. In addition to the discussion of printed treatises of Pico della Mirandola, John Reuchlin, Paul Ricci, and others, selections and an analysis are given for the hitherto unpublished *Saincte et trescrestienne cabale* of Jean Thenaud of Angoulême, completed in 1519 and dedicated to Francis I. That Ramon Lull was not a cabalist is restated. In matters of detail, it is said that the Dominicans generally were opposed to cabalistic studies (p. 61), but that Agostino Giustiniani, Bishop of Nebbio, was a Dominican is not indicated (pp. 32-33); also Reuchlin is wrongly credited with a presentation of the doctrine of the Trinity which is heretical (p. 48). Of Pierre le Loyer we are told that he "understood and illustrated the valid techniques of cabalistic science, used as a means of developing the allegorical sense of the Scriptures" (p 87). It is doubtful whether the author meant this just as it sounds, for he knows that cabala is not a science and has no valid techniques. Of his very sound conclusions, these deserve quoting: "Perhaps the Christians who declined to recognize the value of cabala in the conversion of the Jews . . . recognized . . . that the use of cabalistic interpretations falsified the true appeal of Christianity"

(p. 77). "None of the Christian interpreters knew much about the cabala" (p. 113). "It had rapidly proved a blind alley for Christian thought" (p. 99). "The period was transitional in the history of thought. . . . At such a time any road looks fair and worthy to be explored. Of cabala this might well have seemed more true than of most other roads. For cabala had a Hebrew source and Hebrew was recognized by the scholarship of the time as the oldest of languages, as the language of divine revelation" (p. 114). (PATRICK W. SKEHAN)

BONNIWELL, WILLIAM R., O.P. *A History of the Dominican Liturgy with a Study of the Roman Rite before the Thirteenth Century.* (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc. 1944. Pp. xiv, 386. $3.50.) The story of the origin and development of the Dominican rite is told with interest and erudition by Father Bonniwell in the comprehensive work before us. Organized by St. Dominic as an order of canons regular, the preaching friars have been conspicuous for their devotion to the liturgy. The author traces the development of the Dominican liturgy through its period of original diversity, due to the widespread dispersion of the sons of St. Dominic, to the uniformity resulting from the commission of the Four Friars and the revision of Humbert of Romans, and its subsequent survival among the rites suppressed by Pope Pius V, down through the three centuries succeeding the Council of Trent to the liturgical revision of Pius X in the twentieth century.

In treating the moot question of the origin of the Dominican rite, Father Bonniwell adheres to the theory that it is the genuine Roman rite of the early thirteenth century, enriched with certain non-Roman variations and additions, which were not, however, sufficiently important to warrant the classification of the liturgy as Gallican rather than Roman. The author is careful to distinguish between the Dominican liturgy as a variant of the Roman rite and separate rites like the Ambrosian and the Mozarabic, maintaining that the liturgy of the Friars Preachers is a mediaeval Roman rite, which was used principally, but not exclusively, by the Dominicans. Consequently, the liturgical use of the Friars Preachers is as truly a Roman rite as is the liturgy which is now almost universal in the Latin Church. Rigid uniformity in ritual did not exist in the mediaeval Church so that the Roman liturgy was expressed in a number of variants, all equally Roman. The sons of St. Dominic made a choice among these variations and their selection has developed into what is now known, rather inexactly, as the Dominican rite.

Certain peculiarities of the Dominican Mass are shown to be of Roman origin, representing observances which have passed into desuetude in our more familiar Latin Mass. Thus, the wearing of the amice over the head, when approaching the altar, was a Roman custom, which was supplanted by the wearing of the biretta only from the sixteenth century. The preparation of the chalice at the beginning of Mass, characteristic of the Dominican ceremonial, was a fairly common practice among seculars and regulars in mediaeval times. In the early thirteenth century, after the consecration, the chalice was elevated in Paris but not in Rome and the Dominicans followed Rome rather than Paris until the double elevation became universal. The practice of the Friars Preachers of receiving Communion from the left hand is found to have been practiced also

in Rome. The author gives excellent support to his theory that the Romanization of the Dominican rite, begun by the Four Friars and carried to a successful conclusion by Humbert of Romans, was effected against the powerful opposition of Paris. Hence, he concludes, that the sons of St. Dominic have a real Roman rite and not the Roman rite as Gallicanized by Paris.

The material make-up of the book is attractive, although the volume is heavier than its size warrants. The excellent bibliography, unfortunately in low-point type, includes both manuscripts, with the place of their custody, and printed books. The index is adequate and easy of consultation because of the judicious use of bold-face type. (WILLIAM J. LALLOU)

BROGAN, D. W. *The American Character.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1944. Pp. xxi, 169. $2.50.) As Americans we cannot but envy the ability of the occasional foreigner to understand us perhaps even better than we understand ourselves. Lord Bryce and De Tocqueville are still required reading for the major in politics, and, while Mr. Brogan's more discursive and less pretentious essay may never find its way into the footnotes of future dissertations, it will be welcomed today by the average educated layman.

It goes a long way towards a solution of the "American problem," which, as Brogan says, is in reality a double problem: "It is the problem of making intelligible to the American people the nature of the changes in the modern world which they can lead, or which they can resist, but which they cannot ignore. . . . There is the second problem: the problem of making intelligible the normal American's view of the world, of his own history and destiny."

Mr Brogan, of course, is primarily concerned with the second of these two problems. It is no reflection on his sincerity to suggest that in a sense his essay is a type of "special pleading." In sympathetically interpreting and explaining to his fellow-Englishmen America's "natural isolationism," he is at the same time, the reviewer takes it, pleading (ever so courteously) with Americans themselves to lead and not to ignore "the changes in the modern world."

Even the most sensitive of Anglo-phobes will fail to detect the slightest trace of arrogance or condescension in Brogan's almost hyperbolic estimate of American customs and accomplishments. Our achievement, he says, is unique in world history: "To have created a free government, over a continental area, without making a sacrifice of adequate efficiency or of liberty. . . ."

With a gracefulness of style which can quote as effectively from the Italian of Dante as from the more flippant Americanese of James Thurber, Mr. Brogan gives us in passing a series of vignettes on American education, religion, politics, and economics. He is always provocative and never superficial. And, while not everyone will agree with all of his rather brilliant generalizations, few will deny that his book provides both the English and ourselves with at least a point of departure for a better understanding of the United States—in the past, the present, and, it is to be hoped, the future. Admittedly, "understanding each other is not enough, but it is an indispensable beginning." (GEORGE G. HIGGINS)

CHAMBERLIN, WILLIAM HENRY. *The Ukraine. A Submerged Nation.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1944. Pp. 91. $1.75.) The *Ukraine* means "borderland" or "marchland." The area has been since the ninth century, with its centre

at Kiev, the cradle of Russian polity and civilization. Yet the Mongol invasion of the thirteenth century (the date 1340 for the sack of Kiev, is a *lapsus calami* for 1240, p. 4) deflected to—ultimately—the Muscovite north the stream of socio-political and cultural continuity. Thereafter Kievan Russia became what its present name implies—a march between Muscovite Russia and the Lithano-Polish commonwealth which engulfed it. Mr. Chamberlin is right in beginning the Ukrainian history from the "heroic age" of the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries, for only then did the amorphous, purely ethnic continuation of Kievan Russia fully awaken to a national consciousness and a sense of distinctness from both the Muscovite Russians and the Poles.

The book, in seven chapters, touches with competence and impartiality upon the Ukrainians' past, present, and future in their strife and aspirations for national independence in the face of powerful neighbors. It is a valuable, albeit popular, contribution towards the elucidation of the delicate problem of the Ukraine, as well, perhaps, as of that of all the "decapitated" or "submerged" nationalities of Central and Eastern Europe.

One is surprised, however, now that the matter of the Eastern rites of the Catholic Church has been sufficiently brought to the fore in the works of Fortescue, Attwater, etc., to see the Catholics of the (Slavo-)Byzantine rite still described as "the Uniate Church, which retains the Orthodox ritual (*sic!*) but acknowledges the spiritual leadership of the Pope" (p. 84), or contrasted with those of the Latin rite as "Uniate Catholics" vs. "Roman Catholics" (p. 13).

The volume is well-edited and printed and supplied with an index, but the absence of maps may be regretted. (CYRIL TOUMANOFF)

CLARKE, W. K. LOWTHER. *Eighteenth Century Piety.* (London: S. P. C. K.; New York: Macmillan Co. 1944. Pp. viii, 160. $2.75.) Although the purpose of *Eighteenth Century Piety* is "to contribute to the history of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge by summarizing the books published by the Society in the eighteenth century, and by telling the story of Henry Newman, Secretary from 1708 to 1743," students of eighteenth-century backgrounds will find some interesting information in the sections "Pastoralia" and "Some Notes on Charity Schools." The rest, including those dealing with nineteenth-century persons and events—about one-fourth of the 160 pages—are of little significance; in the words of the author, they are "minor exercises best described as recreation."

"Pastoralia" are brief suggestive notes on some religious matters about which more ought to be known before the prevailing verdict of historians upon the religious life of the eighteenth century is accepted as final. To verify or to modify some of the current notions, investigators may explore several fields; the author chose the contents of the books published by the S. P. C. K. He records some enlightening facts concerning church services, the sacraments (baptism, confirmation, holy communion, confession), home life, moral corruption, the clergy, controversy, and foreign missions. A page of the missions section is given to the consideration of slaves in relation to Anglicanism as discussed in a book, *Two Sermons Preached to a Congregation of Black Slaves at the Parish Church of S. P.* [St. Peter in Talbot County] *in the Province of Maryland,* by an American Pastor [Thomas Bacon], 1749.

Before they are applied to eighteenth-century Anglicanism as a whole, the conclusions reached will have to be compared with the evidence gathered from other fields, particularly the thousands of printed sermons of the period, which have not yet received the attention they deserve. (FRANCIS E. LITZ)

DUNLAP, LESLIE W., Assistant Librarian, University of Wisconsin. *American Historical Societies, 1790-1860.* (Madison: Privately Printed. 1944. Pp. ix, 238. $3.50.)

Defining his term as "associations of individuals organized primarily to collect, reserve, and make available the materials for the history of the United States or a section of it," thus excluding from consideration societies and institutions whose interest in historical pursuits was incidental or without sustaining membership, the author describes in this carefully-documented study, first, such phases as the background, establishment, administration, financing, and work of the sixty-five societies which existed before the Civil War; and, in the second part, gives a sketch of each of these organizations within the unit of the states and the District of Columbia. About half of these associations "are still alive." From the record here presented, of solid foundations laid by scholars and public-spirited professional men, of careful administration, and of enthusiasm for the collection, preservation, and publication of source materials, it is easy to understand the continuing interest in this field and the steady growth of such societies to the present number of over 800. The pattern has remained about the same with, however, an increasing number of state and local organizations, the growth of ethnic and religious societies, and the birth of historical commissions, and research institutions with historical departments.

Dr. Dunlap has based his study on the publications of the societies, on the extensive files of the corresponding secretaries of five associations, and upon fugitive printed accounts. Supplementary information on the publications of these and later organizations will be found in A. P. C. Griffin's *Bibliography of American Historical Societies* (*Report* of the American Historical Association, 1905, II, printed in 1907); and in the reviewer's *List of American Periodicals and Serial Publications in the Humanities and Social Sciences,* which appeared as Bulletin No. 21 of the American Council of Learned Societies (March, 1934).

No reference to any Catholic historical society will be found in this volume, since none existed before 1860. (LEO F. STOCK)

DUNNEY, JOSEPH A. *Church History in the Light of the Saints.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1944. Pp. vii, 465. $2.75.) The title is a good description of this volume: a general church history giving special prominence to one saint in each century, from St. Peter to the Curé of Ars. After nineteen chapters on the Church in the old world, two additional chapters relate the beginnings of the Church in South and North America, around the lives of St. Rose of Lima and St. Isaac Jogues. Each chapter is preceded by a table of dates for the century. Twenty-one short bibliographies (pp. 453-458) and five black and white maps complete the plan for presenting church history around the lives of typical saints.

The high school student, for whom the book seems particularly intended, may find it a readable and picturesque sketching of the main currents of church his-

tory, but the teacher will be obliged to correct a large number of incidental misstatements. To mention only a few, in the life of St. Peter the legendary activities of Simon Magus in Rome are related as true. St. Justin is represented as discoursing eloquently about God, but having "not a word" to say "of the inner Christian mysteries" (p. 33), whereas he is our chief witness in the second century on these inner mysteries. *Latin* Christian literature is said to have originated "in Alexandria and Carthage" (p. 45). St. Thomas Aquinas saw the influence of Plato "in the books of the New Testament and the Fathers" (p. 268). And "in Bologna, whither he was ordered in 1271, . . . the Summa saw the light of day" (p. 270). "In 1263 Pope Urban IV sent him to England; and he sat at the General Council held at Holburn" (p. 276). "The crisis came in 1870. That year the Italians seized Rome, while the Prussians defeated Austria at Sedan" (p. 406).

Some of the bibliographies will be helpful (St. Benedict, St. Columbanus), but many of them consist largely of items that are out-of-date and out of print. On St. Peter the only work mentioned later than 1906 is Duchesne's *Early History of the Christian Church*. Fourteen titles on St. Patrick range from 1647 to 1905. Titles and authors are occasionally confused as, e.g., Denifle with Grisar, Parkman with Campbell. French works are given English titles. Altogether, a fine idea, well-outlined and proportioned, has been marred by a lack of careful revision. (FRANCIS X. GLIMM)

Editorial Committee, William Penn Tercentenary Committee. *Remember William Penn, 1644-1944*. (Harrisburg: Department of Public Instruction. 1944. Pp. xvii, 173; vi, 78.) This book is not only refreshing for the vividness with which it transports one back three hundred years to Penn's times but it is highly suggestive as a character study.

His age, not much worse, perhaps, than our own, was a conscienceless age, wholly absorbed in frivolities, in drinking and gambling, in the face of civil and foreign wars, the plague and the Great Fire. Religion had shrunk to an outward array which often degenerated into intolerance and religious tyranny in regard to non-conforming minorities. Milton, Swift, and Locke thundered against the evils of the times but their generation remained unimpressed. William Penn, however, stood up, an unflinching solitary figure, and by the light given to him, became the preacher of the dignity of man and called for a faith translated into action. "If we would amend the World," he proclaimed, "we should mend Our selves, and teach our Children to be, not what we are, but what they should be."

The many-sided personality of Penn is effectively presented in the first five chapters. The writers picture him as the man, the strength of his religious convictions, the lover and defender of freedom and his character appears at all times imbued with a true and sincere spirit of humanity. Of interest is the article, "William Penn the Builder of States," by Donald H. Kent, a member of the staff of the Pennsylvania Historical Commission. In it Mr. Kent points out how long ago the great Quaker not only envisioned but actually determined the political society which has since evolved in the United States. The chapter, "William Penn and the Modern World," affirms that Penn's claim to fame is not based alone on the fact that he will everlastingly be remembered as the founder of Pennsylvania, but in the little-known fact that he was among the first to

formulate a plan for world peace. Penn's mind, deeply imbued with the conviction of the dignity of the individual, expounded his ideas of social justice and of a permanent peace based on moral grounds rather than on unyielding machinery. It makes interesting reading and the editors have done the public a service by including this essay. Penn's "Fruits of Solitude," found at the end of the book and inserted after the selected bibliography and the index, should have been placed immediately after "Some Characteristic Writings of William Penn." Nothing better could have been offered as characteristic of William Penn than the thoughts and expressions which enshrine the wisdom and philosophy of this great man. Profuse and well-selected illustrations help to visualize Penn's times with a fine touch of reality.

Remember William Penn should be added to the list of "must" books for the state's high schools and colleges and for all serious students and lovers of Pennsylvania. (JOHN CANOVA)

EVENNETT, H. O. *The Catholic Schools of England and Wales.* (Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co. 1944. Pp. ix, 141. $1.25.) The purpose of this contribution to the Current Problems Series is to offer a general survey of the Catholic schools of England and Wales that will enable the reader to appreciate the extent, character, and significance of Catholic school problems in England and Wales. It briefly analyzes the school problems by answering four questions: why are there Catholic schools, which are the Catholic schools, what are the Catholic schools like, and what is the significance of the Catholic schools in England today? A summary of the Church's part as a religious and moral teacher in the past and present indicates the philosophical principles which form the basis of Catholic education. The chapter devoted to the history and development of elementary and secondary schools sketches the educational work of the diocesan clergy and of the members of religious congregations with a clearness that offers to the reader no doubt as to which are the Catholic schools of England. The story of many years of educational effort is found in this chapter.

An external feature of the Catholic schools in England, with the exception of the upper-class preparatory schools for boys and the mixed public elementary schools, is described by the writer as the unique place which Catholic clergymen hold as teachers in the school system. The business of education is not, in effect, autonomous. He describes it as a function of the spiritual. A reference is made to the gradual acceptance of the certificate-dominated educational program of the other English schools by the Catholic schools without loss of the central unifying point of the Catholic religion. A concluding chapter outlines the significance of the Catholic schools in England today. The problems of Catholic schools are described as national problems, centered around the national character and institutions of the Englishman and the English constitution.

The style is direct and simple. Since there is no claim to an exhaustive analysis of the development of Catholic schools, this modest volume offers a valuable contribution to the history of educational institutions in England. Brief references to many schools will lead the reader to valuable historical records. With an appreciation of the past, the reader will see the need of a further study of the problems of the Catholic schools of England and Wales. (LEO J. MCCORMICK)

FURFEY, PAUL HANLY, Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology in the Catholic University of America. *The Mystery of Iniquity.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1944. Pp. ix, 192. $2.00.) This book is directed against "conformist Catholics," whom the author regards as agents of the devil, who are aligned against the Kingdom of God, who are caught up in the mystery of iniquity, working for the building up of the "Mystical Body of Satan" (*sic!*). It is a charge of bad faith, a charge that "compromising Catholics water down their doctrine to make it more acceptable to non-Caholics." The conformists are "ashamed of the gospel." They are finally written off with: "these dastards, these cravens, these lily-livered poltroons are the allies, conscious or unconscious, of the mystery of iniquity."

There is much provocative criticism of Catholics and Catholic organizations in this volume. But there is also much that will prompt the reader to wish that some candid friend had advised the writer to let his manuscript "cool off" before he sent it to the publisher. He would have saved himself from publishing a book that lacks balance and fairness.

The lack of balance is most manifest in the pessimistic emphasis on the power of the devil. Certainly the Fathers and the full Catholic conscience have been at least equally impressed with the certainty of Christ's victory in this world.

Again, it is one thing to hold up for ridicule Catholics who conform with error in questions of principle—those who, e.g., admit white supremacy, advocate divorce, deny workers the right to a human wage, etc. It is another to do the same thing with those who, in the selection of means towards social objectives, do not believe that the so-called supernatural means which the author champions are the only ones which the Catholic must or should use. Thus the Catholic Social Action literature of the United States, published by Bishop Haas, Monsignor Ryan, Paul Weber, and many other laymen and priests, all of whom the author strongly but veiledly condemns, have insisted on the phase of Catholic social thinking which before them was almost totally ignored or denied—and still is not accepted by a large percentage of American Catholics.

In accusing these people of being faithless Catholics, the author will, if he looks about him, find himself in strange company. On the other hand, if he were to give them deserved recognition, he would also find himself in the company of those with whom, by his own hypothesis, a really sincere Catholic is supposed to have nothing in common—the "pagans" on *P.M.*, the *New Republic*, etc. The author makes a strong plea that sincere Catholics "separate" themselves, "come apart," isolate themselves. Fathers Wilfrid Parsons,S.J., and J. Courtnay Murray, S.J., come off looking like dangerous Catholics. And for that matter, so does Pope Pius XII. (DANIEL M. CANTWELL)

GODBOLD, ALBEA. *The Church College of the Old South.* (Durham: Duke University Press. 1944. Pp. xi, 221. $3.00.) If one wonders at the unnecessary multiplication of second-rate colleges in the South, the answer is to be found in this book. Here are summary sketches of the denominational schools founded prior to the Civil War throughout the coastal area. Mr. Godbold explains the conditions that brought about a boom in college founding. Quickly and clearly he notes the opposition to the movement, the jealousies, the zealous interests, and the struggles to exist.

Catholics were not in the competition. Georgetown University is mentioned but it hardly falls within the scope of the book. The work has interest for Catholics in that it shows that at one time the Protestant sects recognized the need for definite instruction in religion—and particularly in one's respective creed and not in some type of universalism. But now these colleges stand, almost without exception, as proofs that long ago the individual Protestant sects have given up the attempt to educate on denominational lines.

The denominational college in the struggle for existence had to accept state aid, and with it, state interference, dictation, and finally control. Whatever denominational distinction there is among these colleges today is only traditional or nominal. The beginnings of this trend toward denominational nihility may be seen in Mr. Godbold's book.

The book has an extensive bibliography and shows evidence of considerable research and study. There is an index. (RICHARD C. MADDEN)

HERSHBERGER, GUY F. *War, Peace and Nonresistance.* (Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press. 1944. Pp. xv, 415. $2.50.) The years between the two World Wars witnessed a great interest in the moral aspects of war. The three peace churches: Mennonites, Quakers, and Dunkers have consistently upheld the principle of nonresistance in face of the greatest difficulties. They believe that the Christian churches are compromising on the message of peace taught in the Bible. Dr. Hershberger has compiled the standard work on nonresistance. His scriptural exposition (pp. 12-56) comprises the discussion of 349 scripture passages (list given pp. 399-402). Thousands of well-meaning believers in nonresistance have laid down their lives to remain true to their convictions. From 1525 till 1535 no less than 5000 Menonnites were killed in Switzerland and many more later in that country up to the year 1614. In Holland executions of Mennonites continued for forty years up to 1574. In Transylvania and Hungary the last executions of Mennonites took place about 1760. In colonial North America executions of Quakers are also recorded. Yet short of death these plain people have suffered all kinds of persecutions in all ages and countries. In 1918 two conscientious Mennonite objectors died from the results of ill treatment received in the Leavenworth, Kansas, penitentiary. In Europe the Mennonites gave up the principle of nonresistance and in America individuals did the same in the face of mistreatment and mob violence. Yet the churches held fast to the traditions of their fathers. The hymns sung in praise of the Mennonite martyrs and the ponderous *Book of Martyrs* helped to keep up the spirit of nonresistance among church members. The latest edition of the *Martyrs' Mirror* was published at Scottdale, Pennsylvania, in 1938; the first edition in Dutch was printed in 1660. In peace times the Mennonites practise nonresistance in regard to all professions which use force or advocate force; accordingly, they do not hold any political office, nor do they take part in any struggle between capital and labor. Hence they believe in a complete separation of church and state (pp. 188-201). Twenty casuistry cases facing the nonresistants are discussed (pp. 360-370). The three historic peace churches have taken the Sermon on the Mount literally and despite restricted membership have exerted through the centuries a salutary influence which is far out of proportion to their numbers. The work of Dr. Hershberger is a challenge to the

compliant assumption that wars are always just. All lovers of real peace are earnestly recommended to study this authoritative work on *War, Peace and Nonresistance.* (JOHN M. LENHART)

LEMKIN, RAPHAEL. *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe.* (New York: Columbia University Press for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of International Law. 1944. Pp. xxxviii, 674. $7.50.) The Polish scholar and lawyer, Raphael Lemkin, has performed an admirable service for historians, publicists, government officials, and the general public by preparing this careful analysis and collection of the orders, laws, and decrees issued by the Axis during its reign of terror in the conquered nations of Europe.

For historians, Dr. Lemkin has brought together in readily accessible form the basic documents on Nazi occupation. Public officials are indebted to him for the assistance his work gives to the formulation of post-Nazi problems. Every reader will profit from his chapters analyzing the purposes and application of Nazi measures of conquest and from his suggestions concerning modes and agencies for redressing Nazi wrongs. Particularly important is the chapter on law which summarizes the evidence that Nazi laws in occupied countries are bereft of moral content and of respect for human rights; the chapter on the inhuman treatment of the Jews in which Dr. Lemkin shows that this treatment was used to serve as a propaganda device for the promotion of the anti-Christian idea of the essential inequality of humans and of German racial superiority; and the chapter on "genocide" (the destruction of a nation or ethnic group) by a synchronized attack on its very existence by mass killings and starvation diets and on the political, social, cultural, moral, and religious life of a people.

Certain conclusions of Dr. Lemkin will be challenged in some quarters, e.g., his statement that the German people as a whole participated voluntarily in the Nazi destruction of Europe and that the United Nations should plan to replace the aggressive German industrial potential by more peaceful patterns of economic life, such as agriculture. On the other hand, a more favorable reception may be given to his proposal that the Germans be impelled to replace their theory of master race by a theory of master (*sic*) morality, international law, and true peace. Special attention may be given to Dr. Lemkin's idea of a nation as signifying constructive co-operation and original contributions based upon genuine traditions, genuine culture, and a well-developed national psychology, and to his proposal to make international crimes out of oppressive and destructive actions against individuals as members of a national, religious, or racial group and the malicious destruction of works of art and culture. (CHARLES P. O'DONNELL)

LOUGHREY, MARY ELLEN. *France and Rhode Island, 1686-1800.* (New York: King's Crown Press. 1944. Pp. vii, 186. $2.25.) Miss Loughrey has studied with historic thoroughness the over-all influence which the French of France exerted on Rhode Island from the last half of the seventeenth to the last half of the eighteenth century. This monograph contains all the minute details of a very graphic picture of the *apport ou fait français* in a New England state. The influence of the French in Rhode Island feels a certain void. And

the prime reason for this was that much of the French influence could be traced to circumstances and expedients of war and religion. With the cessation of hostilities on the continent, the circumstances which fostered a temporary comradeship of the French sailors and soldiers with the Rhode Islanders also ceased. The opinion here espoused by the reviewer is favored by the author's chapters on "The Frenchmen in Rhode Island during the Intercolonial Wars," and "The French Fleet and Army in Rhode Island." The presence of foreign sailors in American ports during World War II does not necessarily imply that their influence will be felt. On the contrary, their influence, if there be any, will be as fleeting as time.

On the cultural side, the same poverty of influence is found. The war, continental or intercolonial, furnished the American journalists with newspaper matter. Here again it was only natural that the American journalists should seize upon war news for interesting columns in their respective organs. Even Voltaire's name and ideas found sufficient space in the Rhode Island newspapers, much as George Bernard Shaw does today. Ideas, be they orthodox, heterodox, or heretical, have a certain charm and enchantment and, therefore, the newspapermen pounced upon such ideas for their 'bread and butter.' And in Rhode Island such notices of ideas from popular thinkers does not convince the reviewer that those ideas were instrumental in influencing the minds of the Rhode Islanders.

Despite the poverty of French influence upon Rhode Islanders of yesteryear, Miss Loughrey's monograph is abundantly documented and written in a fluid style. It also unveils in eloquent fashion the author's struggle for many hours over original manuscripts, innumerable documents, and volumes. And it is precisely for this reason that the reviewer finds that this work brings out with scientific accuracy the meager apportionment of French influence from the cultural, historical, and philosophical points of view in Rhode Island. The *apport français* in Rhode Island can be truthfully labeled as a hasty sprinkling of French influence there during the eighteenth century. (GILBERT F. LEDUC)

MACLEAN, DONALD A. *A Dynamic World Order.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1945. Pp. xii, 235. $2.50.) Dr. MacLean has written an accurate, if somewhat theoretical and hortatory, analysis and summary of the papal principals for peace. Perhaps it was necessary to be repetitious at times to bring home, as it were by a cumulative effect, the supreme importance of the author's and the Papacy's first and primary principle—". . . a full recognition of the primacy, sacredness and worth of the human person and unity and solidarity of all men as brothers under the Fatherhood of God—a unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."

The entire book is, in a sense, an extended commentary on this basic principle, with the author leaning (perhaps too heavily?) on theory and abstractions rather than on specific and practical examples for many of his salutary applications. A more detailed analysis of the immediate and formidable obstacles to the fulfillment of the principles for peace might have rendered the book more effective and more serviceable at this particular time. In any event, however, the over-all effect of the finished product will indeed be wholesome if it succeeds in infecting the reader with the author's sincere and contagious zeal

for a lasting peace founded on a wise and prudent application of justice and Christian charity. While there are few men of good will who would disagree with any substantial part of the theory of Dr. MacLean's presentation, there are undoubtedly some who would question or modify a few of his applications and points of emphasis. By way of example:

(1.) Is it altogether accurate to imply that the Basque Catholics allied themselves with the Spanish Loyalists merely because of their desire for autonomy? A careful reading of the recent autobiography of Aguirre suggests that the President of the Basques, for one, disagrees with Franco in a very fundamental way, over his philosophy of the state. (2.) Maritain, among others, would undoubtedly modify the over-simplified emphasis which the author places on birth control and the degeneracy of family life in France as a basic cause of the sudden military collapse of that unhappy nation. (3.) The author's indictment of neutrality might have been sharpened by a frank discussion of the neutrality of specific nations—Ireland, for example. (4.) Again, his very timely indictment of excessive nationalism might have been made more telling and effective by a frank analysis of the attitude of specific nations, so-called Catholic nations included. (5.) "Scientism" comes in for some deservedly hard words. But scientists may well reply that the philosophers have frequently enjoyed the luxury of operating in an academic and somewhat unrealistic vacuum.

The principal weakness of the book, in the opinion of the reviewer, lies in its reluctance to face up squarely to the failure of the Christians (and not only of their political leaders, about whom, without identifying them, the author occasionally has some hard things to say) to build a Christian peace between the two wars. Honesty will compel us to admit that many of us, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, have sometimes lagged disastrously behind a great leader such as the late President Roosevelt—whom Dr. MacLean quotes in passing with approval—in our recognition not only of the facts of international life, but of the principles of international peace as well. After all, there were a lot of Catholic isolationists in the United States before Pearl Harbor (including some who are now pointing a pharisaical finger at statesmen), and not all of them have been converted.

All in all, the volume is a very useful commentary, many of whose suggestions have been acted upon, at least in part, since the manuscript went to the printer. In the second edition the proof-reader will undoubtedly correct the numerous typographical errors. (GEORGE G. HIGGINS)

MULHERN, PHILIP F., O.P. *The Early Dominican Laybrother.* (Washington: Dominican House of Studies. 1944. Pp. x, 98. $2.00.) The subject of this study, as Father Mulhern states in his preface, is one to which scholars have given little attention. There is nothing glamorous about the life of a laybrother, Dominican or otherwise, and in the religious community his place has been customarily assumed so incidental to that of the cleric, that it has not received its due. It is, then, a surprise to learn that the early Dominican laybrother was unique among laybrothers, for where the older religious orders retained the laybrotherhood as a vocation in and for itself, the Dominican rule provided for the laybrother with no other view than that of freeing the preacher for his mission of teaching. And while his spiritual well-being was not neglected, quite

the contrary as Father Mulhern shows, nonetheless, only so many were to be admitted into the order as were required "to care for the corporal needs of the brethren" (p. 39). What these needs were and with what care the early constitutions set forth the duties and qualifications of those assigned to meet those needs, is interestingly described by the author.

Two minor criticisms might be suggested. Though Father Mulhern writes with a fine sense of detachment, one hesitates to accept his explanation that the decision to permit a laybrother to enter the clerical state only with the special permission of the provincial was due in large measure "to a concern lest incapable and unlearned preachers be sent abroad" (p. 48). It is difficult to see why the laybrother could not as readily have been held to entrance requirements as the lay candidate. Furthermore, the puzzling indifference of the provincials to the Pope's repeated injunction that the novitiate extend for an entire year (pp. 56, 57), all the more surprising in view of the superfluity of laybrothers at that time, fails to arouse the author's curiosity. If the heads of a newly-established order, still fired with the enthusiasm of its sainted founder, could thus have ignored the orders of the Pope in a purely administrative matter, it is easier to account for the meager response those decretals received which were addressed to the whole Church and which touched upon the lives and incomes of the clergy.

Father Mulhern overlooked several typographical errors: regime for regimen (p. 74); regulem (p. 36, n. 36); feniunt (p. 91, n. 16); and he neglected to render the complete translation of two footnotes in the English quotations (p. 37, n. 39; p. 56, n. 35), in the second of which the qualifying phrase "except for good reason" is omitted. (JOSEPH H. DAHMUS)

PARKER, DONALD DEAN, Head of the Department of History and Political Science, South Dakota State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts. *Local History. How to Gather It, Write It, and Publish It.* (New York: Social Science Research Council. 1944. Pp. xiv, 186. $1.00.) The growing importance of local history, especially in relation to the social and economic fields, is being recognized in many ways. Professional historians are wisely lending substantial help to amateur groups as a means of fostering local research by county and other local historical societies. In Pennsylvania the schools are participating in the movement through the Junior Historians, and similar organizations are being formed elsewhere.

The Social Science Research Council has furnished this guide to fill the need of the local society that possesses interest, historical material, and an ambitious but untrained membership. It was revised and edited by Bertha E. Josephson for the Committee on Guide for the Study of Local History. In addition to answering the more obvious questions that would arise, this book will be useful for its suggestions and general discussion of research both to the trained and untrained student.

Written in three parts, as indicated in the subtitle, the section on gathering materials is stimulating to the experienced historian and challenging to him who decries the value of local history. The writer who records folkways, habits, dialect, and customs for his locality is performing a service that will increase in importance in future years. Sources of information for such writings include

old residents, account books, relics, heirlooms, letters, diaries, and keepsakes. The value of newspaper advertisements as historical material is aptly illustrated. Church records and cemetery inscriptions are similarly discussed with enlivening examples and illustrations. A model outline for a local history is offered as an interesting feature.

The technique of gathering material and writing is adequately treated and a section is profitably devoted to a discussion of various tried methods of publishing local history, costs and possible returns. An extensive bibliography is appended. (J. WALTER COLEMAN)

PATTEE, RICHARD. *Essai sur L'évolution historique de l'Amérique espagnole.* (Port-au-Prince: Imprimerie de l'Etat. 1943. Pp. vi, 80.) During the course of 1943, Mr. Pattee accepted an invitation to deliver a series of lectures in the University of Haiti on the subject which forms the title of this small volume. In seven rapid strokes he outlined the avenues of that evolution: geographical and economic bases of Hispanic America; the fundamental institutions of the colonial epoch; the origins of the wars of independence; the problems posed by those wars for the succeeding republics; the nature of "dictatorship" in Latin America; ethnic and demographic problems; and, lastly, the land question and the economic regime.

This *Essai* seems destined to exert an influence out of all proportion to its modest size and more modest pretensions. It is filled with brilliant syntheses, some original, some developments of borrowed ideas. A more striking quality is the frankness with which the author was able to lay before his audience a subject that is both delicate and difficult.

Two short examples may indicate the point, both of them showing the difference between respect for law and history, and reverence for the man-on-horseback. Pattee makes it clear that we in the United States treat our colonial history as the foundation of our national character, while Hispanic America blames its colonial era for most of its troubles and credits the republican period with every sound value in current life. And he ends the essay with the words: "It is not enough to speak eternally of riches, resources and possibilities, etc., of Latin America. The problem is a human problem. Population, formation (of diversified economies), realization of limitations as well as of possibilities, these are the elements that will contribute toward making Hispanic America a vital force in world life." (W. EUGENE SHIELS)

PEEL, ALBERT (Ed.). *The Notebook of John Penry, 1593.* Edited for the Royal Historical Society from the original in the Huntington Library. Camden Third Series, Volume LXVII. (London: Offices of the Royal Historical Society. 1944. Pp. xxviii, 99.) John Penry was a Puritan minister who, during his brief career, bitterly attacked the Church of England, for which he suffered execution under Elizabeth in 1593. This little book, a reproduction of the notebook of that fiery zealot and ardent non-conformist, has all the earmarks of real historical scholarship. With fine scrutiny the editor reconstructs the original notes, supplementing, where certainty could not be had, with possible explanations and interesting descriptions of the original.

As one would naturally expect, the notebook is of a very fragmentary char-

acter. In addition to the many lacunae, the use of old English spelling makes difficult reading. But it does reflect all of Penry's major interests and convictions. His commentaries on random texts from the Old and New Testament, as well as the drafts of letters, invariably harken back to the idea that the ministry of the priesthood is a detestable thing. A constantly recurring theme is the identification of the Roman Church with Babylon and Antichrist. There is opposition to the Church of England because she retained the "relics of Popery," particularly the episcopacy. In his uncompromising zeal for the abolition of every vestige of Catholicism, Penry even proposed the destruction of the old cathedrals and churches. At the same time he betrays a profound faith in the Bible as the supreme authority for the individual and the Church and in a solid preaching ministry. A great portion of the notebook is devoted to rough drafts of letters to the queen, to Parliament, and to personages in high places, seeking a mitigation of the sufferings of his co-religionists in prison. Frequently he appealed for an opportunity to defend his position, although not even the prospect of execution could shake his convictions. Interesting, too, are his repeated assertions that he has no connection with the libelous Mar-prelate tracts with which his name was associated.

This presentation of Penry's notebook is well done, possessing the added features of an excellent introduction, a dual table of contents, and an index. The reader has the satisfaction of making his judgment from such an intimate document as the personal notebook of a man. Yet one wonders whether the intrinsic value of such a manuscript justifies the painstaking workmanship given it, and whether perhaps such fine scholarship could not have been expended on something more worthy. (PAUL J. KNAPKE)

ROSS, MALCOLM MACKENZIE. *Milton's Royalism. A Study of the Conflict of Symbol and Idea in the Poems.* [Volume XXXIV, Cornell Studies in English.] (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1943. Pp. xiii, 150. $2.50.) This book should be of special interest to historians because the author attempts to show that Milton's opposition to the Stuart monarchy together with his changing political theory colored the language of his poetry and made him abandon kingship or "royalism" as a poetic symbol. Ross tries to distinguish between what he calls the Elizabethan or Spenserian tradition of kingship, consisting of a compound of virtue, power, and outward pomp, and the Caroline concept, illustrated by the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, consisting only in power and outward pomp. In Milton's early poems he finds "royalism" used to "provide aristocratic but abstract suggestions of rank rather than warm and inclusive suggestions of quality" (p. 69), but in *Paradise Lost* "Milton's despotic God is the sick man's dream of strength, the poetic sublimation of anger, frustration, and vengeance" (p. 100), because there was no other idiom but the royalist one "for the representation of sheer power." Finally, in the last poems the symbol is no longer needed, and it does not appear at all in *Samson Agonistes.* Unfortunately, this very interesting theory rests on a foundation of loose terminology and shallow scholarship. The term "royalism" is nowhere adequately defined; it seems to include the "courtly associations" of "sword," "target," "wall," and "tower" (p. 33); on pages 118-119 "majestic," "pomp," and "rural queen;" but again it appears to be the "identification of the crown with either God or the

state" (p. 20). The attempts to include the Elizabethan concept under the terms "Spenserian" or "Arthurian" is still more confusing because on page 16 the Spenserian knight is a "Puritan gentleman," and "Puritan," here and elsewhere, seems to be equated with the traditional concept of moral virtue. The all-important question of dead metaphor is largely ignored. The semantic problem is far broader than this, however, because there is no adequate discussion of the complex political theory underlying the words. His whole discussion of "class tension" in Elizabethan England neglects the contemporary philosophy of the state. His exposition of the theory that the crown was the symbol of unity under Elizabeth but ceased to be such under James and Charles, or, to use his terms, that the symbol lost its validity when it no longer had contemporary reference, is a vast oversimplification of a problem which had been clearly defined early in Elizabeth's reign when Buchanan wrote his *De jure regni apud Scotos*, and which had been the subject of international controversy when Mary Queen of Scots was beheaded. Milton was easily capable of distinguishing the office from the man, and he did so carefully in the *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*.

Although the book contains a great many sweeping generalizations, the documentation is hardly more than a gesture, and there is a tendency to substitute italics for proof (cf. pp. 15, 62, 66, 68, 82, and 127). The "Key to Abbreviations of Works Frequently Cited" is perhaps the key to the weaknesses of the book: there are only ten works, other than Milton's, listed there, and over half of them are cited less than five times and two of them only twice. There is no bibliography. The style is generally quite pleasing and carries more than its share of the burden of proof. (KERBY NEILL)

SIMPSON, W. J. SPARROW. *St. Augustine's Episcopate. A Brief Introduction to His Writings as a Christian.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1945. Pp. xiv, 144. $2.00.) Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, an Anglican theologian of "Catholic" beliefs, has written two previous works on St. Augustine: *The Letters of St. Augustine* (London, 1919), and *St. Augustine's Conversion* (London, 1930). The present volume is a sequel to the latter, on a somewhat smaller scale. In an approximately chronological order, the ninety-odd titles mentioned in the *Retractationes* are here grouped and surveyed in twenty short chapters. The result is not a life of St. Augustine, nor a synthesis of Augustinian thought. It is rather an invitation to students of theology to read Augustine for themselves.

Dr. Simpson sticks closely to the business of introducing St. Augustine and nothing else. After summarizing the historical background for each group of writings, he illustrates their doctrinal values by a few well-chosen quotations. These brief quotations almost constitute a miniature anthology. The emphasis of the work may be seen by citing some chapter headings: "Reply to Dualist Religion," "The Preacher," "On the Necessity of Grace," "Conception of the Church," "The Necessity of Sacraments," and "Prayer for the Dead." In treating the relations of Popes Innocent and Zosimus to the African Church during the Pelagian quarrels, the author avoids any direct reference to the teaching authority of the popes. Twice he introduces quotations which suggest that St. Augustine would not have accepted the Catholic interpretation of Matthew 16, 18. Otherwise, the doctrine may be described as soundly Catholic.

There is no general bibliography, and the chapter bibliographies seem quite out of date. The references are mostly to the Gaume edition (Paris, 1836-39) rather than to Migne or to the Vienna *Corpus*. Altogether this is a useful and competent introduction to the writings of St. Augustine. (FRANCIS GLIMM)

SMITH, EDWARD CONRAD, and Arnold John Zurcher (Eds.), *A Dictionary of American Politics*. (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 1944. Pp. vii, 358. $3.00.) Prepared as "a co-operative undertaking of 14 authorities in the field of American government," this dictionary is the latest and by far the most inclusive of the three volumes which have appeared in this country under the same title. Covering the past and present politics of the United States, it has been designed to reach the average voter with no handy source of information, the readers of the press seeking a clearer understanding of the finer points of discussions of American public affairs, and students of politics. For the convenience of the last group, the volume is also printed in the publishers' familiar College Outline Series.

The editors do not try to offer more than a list of definitions, and, generally speaking, these are clear and to the point. Yet, because certain political concepts are largely philosophical in nature, their definitions cannot be couched in terms sufficiently explicit ever to be entirely satisfactory. Some of them, however, are more than just unsatisfactory; they are erroneous. The natural law, for instance, is not supplementary to the positive law. The positive law complements the natural law—makes explicit what is implicit in the natural law. Applications of the natural law vary as the problems of human living vary; but the natural law is not "identifiable with the sense of justice, of changing content, which pervades a community" (p. 210).

In avoiding errors of fact the editors have achieved near perfection. The only one which attracted this reviewer's attention was that of dating the Boston Massacre in 1775 instead of in 1770 (p. 35). Teachers, informed readers, and students of politics and of United States history would be well recommended to add this work to their list of ready references. (J. ROBERT LANE)

THORNDIKE, LYNN. Professor of History in Columbia University. *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages*. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1944. Pp. xvii. 476. $5.00.) This collection and translation of 176 documents and literary sources, many given *in toto*, carries the story of official and unofficial university life from the first half of the twelfth century—from Abailard and John of Salisbury—to the year 1655. The great majority of the items bear on the University of Paris, but most of the continental universities come in for greater or lesser mention. Oxford and Cambridge are conspicuous by their absence. Professor Thorndike adopts a chronological arrangement of the passages, although he recognizes that this "involves a separation and scattering of those concerned with a common topic." There is a wide selection of these topics—a summary of which is given in the introduction. Among them are: humanism and the humanities or arts, medicine, law, theology, masters, students, languages, fees, etc. The passages vary in length from several lines to several pages. Thus the longest is the Commendation of the Clerk, an educational treatise which extends over thirty-four pages; one of the shortest,

Traveling Expenses for Students in Grammar, 1369, which is only twelve lines long. Most of the passages are from printed sources, of which the chief one is the *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis,* but five hitherto unpublished manuscripts have been utilized, while four selections are from articles in learned periodicals based upon manuscript materials. Of the printed sources, some are inaccessible in the United States.

This collection should be of interest and fascination to both the mediaevalist and to the general reader. Every mediaevalist will find many familiar passages bearing on his special interest, and many unfamiliar but enlightening passages on other phases of university life. The fact that every mediaevalist will also find some of his favorite passages missing is no detraction from this excellent selection of texts. The general reader will discern a wealth of carefully-selected source materials, sometimes amusing and always instructive, translated into very readable English. Two appendices—*De commendatione cleri,* dating from the middle of the fourteenth century, published here for the first time in the Latin text and translated as one of the passages, and Foundation and Location of Colleges at Paris in the Later Middle Ages—a late mediaeval plan of the "left bank" of the Seine, showing the old names of streets and the colleges, and an index complete this well-constructed work. The volume is a credit to the Columbia University Records of Civilization series. (PHILIP S. MOORE)

TREND, J. B. Professor of Spanish in the University of Cambridge. *The Civilization of Spain.* [Home University Library of Modern Knowledge, Vol. CXCIII.] (New York: Oxford University Press. 1944. Pp. 223. $1.25.) Within the compass of a small book Professor Trend succeeds in giving a surprisingly comprehensive history of Spain. The separate periods and phases, with few exceptions, are treated in the light of the best modern scholarship. Footnote references are omitted but an extensive bibliography is given.

The unifying principle of this work is a study of the interplay between theory and practice. The Roman period is praised for its consistency and somewhat similar praise is given the Visigothic period and the early Reconquest. The development of municipal councils and *fueros* is shown to have given Spain a tradition of democracy which has never been entirely lost. The author sees a disagreement between theory and practice in the toleration shown the Moors, outside of wartime, up to the age of Ferdinand and Isabella. He states that the Catholic doctrine in regard to infidels was "to convert or destroy." That, however, was not the teaching of the papacy or Thomas Aquinas, nor of Raymond of Pennafort or Alfonso X.

The decadence of Spain is attributed to over-centralized political rule and to narrowness in religion. Trend laments the choking of the Erasmian "revolution," the locking out of seventeenth-century science and eighteenth-century political thought, and the killing in our day of liberalism. It is in these movements, according to Trend, that Spain would have found its salvation. He manifests a disdain for Catholicism throughout the book. Besides failing to give Catholic terminology its right meaning, he makes Spanish mysticism a matter of philosophy and aesthetics, and to the author the great Spanish jurists were debtors only to pagan philosophers. (SHAWN SHEEHAN)

VAN HOEK, KEES. *Pope Pius XII: Priest and Statesman.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1945. Pp. 106. $2.00.) The author of this work gives us a series of pen sketches of the man who fills the highest office in the world, Pope Pius XII. With a pen picture of Pius XI in a ceremony of St. Peter's in Rome as an introduction, the writer describes the office and then proceeds, in subsequent chapters, to show how Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli fills this office as Pope Pius XII. We are treated with sketches of the Pope as a Roman, as a pupil of Gasparri, as nuncio to Germany, and in his relations with Kaiser William I. We see him threatened by the Communists at Munich after the World War, we observe him as papal Secretary of State and we follow him in a rapid tour of the United States. We are treated to a fine description of his coronation in Rome and then we catch a glimpse of the Pope at work. The final chapter undertakes to show the position of the Pope during the present war, how he tried to preserve the peace, and then how he raised his voice against unjust aggression.

The book should be of interest to the average reader. There is a wealth of information about the papal court and papal usage that will open new vistas to the reader. But the work is that of a journalist and not of a historian. It is not a collection of write-ups from the press of today, but it is an honest effort to give the world a carefully-drawn, sincere portrait of the man the Catholic world reveres as the Vicar of Christ. (MATTHEW PEKARI)

WADE, GLADYS I. *Thomas Traherne* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1944. Pp. x, 269. $3.00.) Miss Wade's book, which includes some of her earlier published materials, represents the final stages in the "discovery" of Thomas Traherne. Working with considerable acumen from the slimmest of clues, she has succeeded in unearthing and putting together with imaginative power both the outer and inner history of his deeply spiritual life. The key piece in assembling the puzzle was Mrs. Susanna Hopton, a valiant woman with whom Traherne formed a deep and intimate religious friendship. *The Centuries of Meditation* were written for her, and we owe to her the preservation of some of the Traherne manuscripts. One of these she had published with some account of the anonymous author, and some of the others were published by a friend after her death on the assumption that they were her own work, but fortunately, Miss Wade has now reclaimed them for the Traherne canon. The section devoted to his works gives a full and penetrating interpretation of each of them, which is particularly valuable for those which are not yet generally accessible. Her treatment of his thought in the final section makes some interesting comparisons with the Cambridge Platonists but as a whole it is tantalizingly incomplete. Miss Wade does not seem too much at home in the field of religious history, and this section is marred by some of the liberal shibboleths such as "men had freed at long last the physical universe from the dead clutch of medieval theology" (p. 223), and the implications in "Descartes . . . provided an example of a rational thinker interested in fundamental problems of religion" (*ibid.*), and, worse still, "the denial by that church [Roman Catholic] of the validity of human reason" (p. 230). Traherne's doctrine of felicity by which he accepted and spiritualized the world, even its creature comforts, might have fruitfully been compared to the Franciscan tradition, especially to St.

Bonaventure, on the one hand, and to the theological justification of the new science by the new emphasis on the study of God in His works on the other. The book is well-indexed and has an important appendix containing a list of Traherne's works, comments on the unpublished manuscripts, and a bibliography of criticism by R. A. Parker. (KERBY NEILL)

WOLLE, FRANCIS, Professor of English Literature in the University of Colorado. *Fitz-James O'Brien. A Literary Bohemian of the Eighteen-Fifties.* [University of Colorado Studies, Series B, Studies in the Humanities. Vol. 2, No. 2.] (Boulder: University of Colorado. 1944. Pp. xi, 309. $2.00.) William Winter's memoir of his friend Fitz-James O'Brien (1828-1862) used to be virtually the only easily available source of information of this rather neglected short story writer, essayist, dramatist, and poet. Professor Wolle, using manuscript material and the fruits of research in Ireland, adds much to the memoir, and details O'Brien's place in the social and literary milieu of New York City to which he came in 1852 after wasting his inheritance in London. He became a prominent member of a group of writers, artists, and actors who patronized Pfaff's beer cellar, the rendezvous of Bohemians—among them Whitman, Aldrich, Bayard Taylor, Stedman, Winter, the journalist Henry Clapp and the actress Ada Clare, "the King and Queen of Bohemia." In fact, O'Brien emerged as the apologist of the kind of life sentimentalized in Murger's famous novel, the acknowledged text, according to Professor Wolle, of Clapp and his "court." Like the typical rebel against convention, he gloried in a hand-to-mouth existence, drank much, made many friends easily and often lived on their generosity, and wrote for the most part from sheer economic necessity. At his death from a wound received while fighting for the Union, he was lamented as a versatile writer and clever young man-about-town who had quickly made an enviable reputation for himself as a contributor to many important magazines and papers and as a writer of macabre fiction.

Professor Wolle thoroughly surveys O'Brien's comparatively large output; but he has performed this task for the bibliographical and historical record, and leaves the impression that the poetry and prose, a few stories excepted, rarely rise above mediocrity and ought to remain buried in the files of periodicals. Professor Wolle frequently repeats literary historians' generalizations on O'Brien's significance in the development of the short story, especially of the Poesque tale successfully imitated in two stories, "The Diamond Lens" and "What Was It?" still popular with anthologists. But these and other critical generalizations are not amplified, and the commentary is only too often a paraphrase of contents. The emphasis falls on the personality of a reckless and witty Irishman described against the background of a sentimental decade which produced such things as *Hiawatha, Prue and I,* and the poems of the Cary sisters. Unfortunately, Professor Wolle's treatment is at times prosaic and out of harmony with the dramatic character of his subject. However, despite its limitations, this study contributes much to an understanding of a man who was representative of clever journalism and America's Grub street. (G. GIOVANNINI)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

History and the Social Science Research Council. Roy F. Nichols (*American Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

Pie XII, la paix et la démocratie. Désiré Bergeron, O.M.I. (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, Apr.).

Un newmaniste français, Henri Bremond. Rodrigue Normandin, O.M.I. (*ibid.*)

Democracy and the Party System. Christopher Dawson (*Month*, Mar.).

The Development of Newman's Political Thought. Alvin Ryan (*Rev. of Politics*, Apr.).

Newman and the Psychology of the Development of Doctrine. H. Francis Davis (*Dublin Rev.*, Apr.).

Don Luigi Sturzo, Christian Democrat. Malcolm Moos (*Amer. Pol. Science Rev.*, Apr.).

El último Nietzsche. José Gaos (*Filosofía y Letras*, Jan.).

The Rise of Anti-Clericalism. Douglas Woodruff (*Month*, Jan.).

Classical Antiquity and the Modern Historian. Richard L. Porter (*Histor. Bull.*, Mar.).

The Renaissance—Origin of the Peace Problem. Thomas P. Neill (*ibid.*).

The Dance on the Jesuit Stage. Artur F. Michel (*ibid.*).

Recent Studies on the Date of the Crucifixion. Edward A. Cerny, S.S. (*Catholic Biblical Quart.*, Apr.).

Bookburning and Censorship in Ancient Rome. Frederick H. Cramer (*Jrn. of Hist. of Ideas*, Apr.).

Christ's Role in the Universe According to St. Irenaeus. Dominic Unger, O.F.M.Cap. (*Franciscan Studies*, Mar.).

Marignolli and the Decline of Medieval Missions in China. Marion A. Habig, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

In Propria Causa [Ockham]. Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

The Life and Works of Thomas of Celano. Gilbert Wdzieczny, O.F.M.Conv. (*ibid.*).

The Persecution of Domitian. R. L. P. Milburn (*Church Quart. Rev.*, Jan.).

Strange Prophet: Nietzsche and the Meaning of History. R. G. Norburn (*ibid.*).

The Lady and the Emperor—A Study in the Domitian Persecution. Johannes Knudsen (*Church Hist.*, Mar.).

Damasiana. José Vives (*Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia*, Jan., 1943).

La Crónica de Juan Biclarense. Fablo Alvarez Rubiano (*ibid.*).

La ceca visigoda de Barcelona. Felipe Mateu y Llopis (*ibid.*).

Repertorio de noticias sobre manuscritos catalanes. Eduardo Junyent (*ibid.*).

Los Rótulos de la Universidad de Valladolid. José Rius Serra (*ibid.*).

Las Profecías del sabio Merlín y sus imitaciones. José Tarré (*ibid.*).

El Concilio Tarraconense de 1530. José M.ª Madurell Marimón (*ibid.*).

El Cardenal Despuig y la Santa Sede. Gabriel Seguí, M.SS.CC. (*ibid.*).

Saints and Women in the Fourth Century. Ambrose W. Vernon (*Christendom*, Spring).

Dedication of Sacred Places in the Early Sources and in the Letters of Gregory the Great. John A. Eidenschink, O.S.B. (*Jurist*, Apr.).

Silk Industry in the Byzantine Empire. R. S. Lopez (*Speculum*, Jan.).

Chaucer and Courtly Love Once More—'The Wife of Bath's Tale.' G. R. Coffman (*ibid.*).

A Scottish 'Father of Courtesy' and Malory. C. O. Parsons (*ibid.*).

The Domitian Bilingual of the *Old-English Annals:* The Latin Preface. F. P. Magoun, Jr. (*ibid.*).

Johs. Sintram de Herbipoli in Two of His MSS. T. C. Petersen (*ibid.*).

More Manuscripts of the *Dragmaticon* and *Philosophia* of William of Conches. Lynn Thorndike (*ibid.*).

Alfodhol and Almadel Once More. *Idem.* (*ibid.*).

Were There Theatres in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries? R. S. Loomis and Gustave Cohen (*ibid.*).

Early Genoese Trade with Atlantic Morocco. H. C. Krueger (*Medievalia et Humanistica*, Fasc. III, 1945).

Giraldus Cambrensis' Debt to Petrus Cantor. Eva M. Sanford (*ibid.*).

Robert Grosseteste's Use of Greek Sources in His *Hexaemeron*. J. T. Muckle, C.S.B. (*ibid.*).

A Comparison of Some of the Sermons and the *Dicta* of Robert Grosseteste. E. J. Westermann (*ibid.*).

The *Excepciones* from Simon of Heynton's *Summa*. Vacher Burch (*ibid.*).

A Synthetic Charter of Chertsey Abbey. Sidney Painter (*ibid.*).

The Earliest Medieval Commentary on Livy Is by Nicholas Trevet. Ruth J. Dean (*ibid.*).

The Electoral Town of Wittenberg. Ernest G. Schwiebert (*ibid.*).

The Earliest Dance-Manuals. Artur Michel (*ibid.*).

An Unnoticed MS of Some Works of Magister Adam of Bocfeld. S. H. Thomson (*ibid.*).

Origins of Monastic Liturgy. John Morson, O.C.R. (*Pax*, Spring).

An Eighth-Century Exegete on Purgatory [the Venerable Bede]. Sister M. Thomas Aquinas Carroll (*American Ecclesiastical Rev.*, Apr.).

The Works of Hroswitha. Zoltán Haraszti (*More Books: the Bulletin of the Boston Public Library*, Mar. and Apr.).

The Papacy and the Levant during the Twelfth Century. Marshall W. Baldwin (*Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in Amer.*, Jan.).

From Crusader Kingdom to Commercial Colony. John L. La Monte (*ibid.*).

The Last Century—from Smyra to Varna (1344-1444). O. Halecki (*ibid.*).

Cassiodorus, the Savior of Western Civilization. Jacob Hammer (*ibid.*).

Papyrology: Its Scope, History, and Achievements. Hans Julius Wolff (*ibid.*).

The 'Glossa Ordinaria' to the Gregorian Decretals. S. Kuttner and Beryl Smalley. (*English Histor. Rev.*, Jan.).

The Layman's Complaint and the Friar's Answer. Francis Lee Utley (*Harvard Theological Rev.*, Apr.).

The Jews in Medieval Carinthia. Joseph Babad (*Historia Judaica*, Apr.).

The Turkish Menace in the Sixteenth Century. Sydney H. Moore (*Mod. Language Rev.*, Jan.).

The Scientific Works of the Court of Alfonso X of Castille: the King and His Collaborators. E. S. Proctor (*ibid.*).

Early Japanese Isolationism. Gustav Voss, S.J. (*Pacific Historical Review*, Mar.).

EUROPEAN

French Revolutionary Pamphlets: a Check List of the Talleyrand and Other Collections. Part I. Horace E. Hayden (*Bulletin of New York Public Library*, Feb. and Apr.).

The Cult of Rousseau and the French Revolution. Gordon H. McNeil (*Jrn. of Hist. of Ideas*, Apr.).

Lord Lansdowne on the French Revolution and the Irish Rebellion. William B. Willcox (*Jrn. of Mod. Hist.*, Mar.).

The Art Confiscations of the Napoleonic Wars. Dorothy Mackay Quynn (*American Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

Emperor Francis II and the Austrian "Jacobins," 1792-1796. Walter Consuelo Langsam (*ibid.*).

Italian Political Pasquinades and Lampoons. Duane Koenig (*Histor. Bull.*, Mar.).

The Soul of Spain. David Rubio. O.S.A. (*Americas*, Jan.).

The Duke of Alba Reconsidered. Walther Kirchner (*Pacific Histor. Rev.*, Mar.).

Central Europe and Russia. Oscar Jászi (*Jrn. of Central European Affairs*, Apr.).

Four Power Pacts: 1933-1945. René Albrecht-Carrié (*ibid.*).

The Problem of Post-War Germany. Francis C. Balling (*ibid.*).

The Social Aspects of the 1944 Warsaw Uprising. Julian Hochfeld (*ibid.*).

The Sixth Partition of Poland. Oscar Halecki (*Rev. of Politics*, Apr.).

Russia and the Peace. Waldemar Gurian (*ibid.*).

On Contemporary Nihilism. Aron Gurwitsch (*ibid.*).

The Prophet of German Nihilism, Ernst Juenger. Eugene Guerster-Steinhausen (*ibid.*).

The Polish Tragedy: Reflections on the Yalta Conference & Debate. John Murray (*Month*, Mar.).

Free Ukraine Is Vital to Lasting Peace. A. A. Granovsky (*Ukrainian Quart.*, Feb.).

Hrushevsky, Historian of Ukraine. G. W. Simpson (*ibid.*).

Ukrainian Sociology after the First World War. J. S. Roucek (*ibid.*).

BRITISH EMPIRE

Mortmain in Medieval London. Helena M. Chew (*English Histor. Rev.*, Jan.).

The Confirmation of the Charters, 1297. Part I. H. Rothwell (*ibid.*).

Personal Tithes. A. G. Little (*ibid.*).

A Letter from the Council to Pope Honorius III, 1220-1. N. Denholm-Young (*ibid.*).

The Christian Tradition in English Law. B. A. Wortley (*Month*, Jan.).

The First English Trinitarians. Tudor Edwards (*Pax*, Spring).

The Conception of Christendom in Renaissance England. Franklin le van Baumer (*Jrn. of Hist. of Ideas*, Apr.).

How England Lost the Christian Tradition. Philip Hughes (*Dublin Rev.*, Apr.).

Standards of British Foreign Policy. Frank Pakenham (*ibid.*).

The Nineteenth Century Reputation of the Elizabethans. Herbert Weisinger (*Mod. Language Quart.*, Mar.).

Belloc—Champion of Catholic Ideas. John J. Barry (*Columbia*, May).

The Surnames of Scotland. Their Origin, Meaning, and History. Part XVII and XVIII. George F. Black (*Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, Mar. and Apr.).

The Expansion of Irish Christianity to 1200. Felim O' Briain (*Irish Histor. Studies*, Sept.).

William King's Administration of the Diocese of Derry, 1691-1703. J. C. Beckett (*ibid.*).

Writings on Irish History, 1943. (*ibid.*).

John Lynch's "De praesulibus Hiberniae." Aubrey Gwynn, S.J. (*Studies*, Mar.).

Biographical Dictionary of Irishmen in France. Part XLII. Richard Hayes (*ibid.*).

AMERICAN

Writings on United States Catholic History, 1944: A Selective Bibliography. Thomas F. O'Connor (*Americas*, Apr.).

A Proposed Regional Public Records Plan for New York State. Hermann Frederick Robinton (*New York Hist.*, Apr.).

Research Materials in the National Archives pertaining to Pennsylvania. Richard G. Wood (*Pennsylvania Mag. of Hist. and Biog.*, Apr.).

Louis Jolliet—the Middle Years: 1674-1686. Jean Delanglez (*Mid-America*, Apr.).

Visitor to Paraguay in 1714. Peter M. Dunne (*ibid.*).

Antoine Laumet, alias Cadillac, Commandant at Michilimackinac: 1694-1697. Jean Delanglez (*ibid.*).

Religious Enthusiasm and Separatism in Colonial New England. Maurice W. Armstrong (*Harvard Theological Rev.*, Apr.).

The Ulster Scots in Colonial and Revolutionary America T. W. Moody (*Studies*, Mar.).

A Frenchman's Note on Certain Lands in Virginia. Beverley Fleet (*Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biography*, Apr.).

Jefferson and the Language of the American Indian. Mabel Morris (*Mod. Language Quart.*, Mar.).

Unpublished Mazzei Letters to Jefferson [*concluded*]. Howard R. Marraro (*William and Mary Quart.*, Jan.).

German Catholic Missionaries in Maryland during the Eighteenth Century. Paul G. Gleis (*Twenty-sixth Report of Soc. for the Hist. of the Germans in Maryland*, 1945).

Ecclesiastical History of the Catholic Germans in Maryland. Charles R. Gellner (*ibid.*).

A Project for a Christian Mission on the Northwest Coast of America, 1798. J. Orlin Oliphant (*Pacific Northwest Quart.*, Apr.).

A Pacific Northwest Bibliography, 1944. Lancaster Pollard (*ibid.*).

Kaskaskia, "The Versailles of the West." Natalia M. Belting (*Indiana Mag. of Hist.*, Mar.).

The Urbanization of the Middle West: Town and Village in the Pioneer Period. Francis P. Weisenburger (*ibid.*).

The First Printing Press of the University of Notre Dame. James A. Corbett (*ibid.*).

Fr. Ambrose Oschwald's Defense. John M. Lenhart, O.F.M.Cap. (*Social Justice Rev.*, June).

Wisconsin Catholics and the Civil War. Benjamin J. Blied (*Social Justice*, Apr. and May).

Legal Holidays in Iowa. William J. Petersen (*Iowa Journal of Politics*, Apr.).

The School Controversy (1891-1893). Allan P. Farrell, S.J. (*Cath. Ed. Rev.*, Apr.).

Portuguese in the School Curriculum. Manoel S. Cardozo (*ibid.*, May).

History of the Albuquerque Indian School. Lillie G. McKinney (*New Mexico Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

Les études de folklore français au Canada. Luc Lacourcière (*Culture*, Mar.).

Les Oblats dans les chantiers. Henri Morisseau, O.M.I. (*Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, Apr.).

Life of Alfred Mordecai in Mexico in 1865-1866, as Told in His Letters to His Family. James A. Padgett (*North Carolina Histor. Rev.*, Apr.).

The Sons of St. Francis in Texas. Carlos E. Castañeda (*Americas*, Jan.).

La Avellaneda's *SAB* and the Political Situation in Cuba. Edith L. Kelly (*ibid.*).

García Morena of Ecuador. Sister Mary Loyola (*ibid.*).

The Franciscan Provinces of Spanish North America. Marion A. Habig, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

Some Remarks on the Term "Aztec Empire." R. H. Barlow (*ibid.*).

The Contribution of the Franciscan College of Ocopa in Peru to the Geographical Exploration of South America. Rudolph Arbesmann (*ibid.*, Apr.).

Don Joaquín García Icazbalceta. Alberto Maria Carreño (*ibid.*).

Literary Contributions of Catholics in Nineteenth-Century Mexico. Francis Borgia Steck (*ibid.*).

Strange Shepherds Come to Latin America. Richard Pattee (*Columbia*, Apr.).

Bitter Harvest in Latin America. Richard Pattee (*ibid.*, May).

Danger Signals for Good Neighbor Policy. Richard Pattee (*America*, Apr. 28 and May 5).

El Beato Martin de Porres, O.P. Jesús García Gutiérrez (*Christus*, Mar. and Apr.).

El culto a Santa Maria de Guadalupe durante la guerra de Independencia. Jesús García Gutiérrez (*Abside*, Jan.).

Los Jesuítas en la provincia de Quito de 1570 a 1774. C. Bayle, S.J. (*Razón y Fe*, Feb.).

En el camino de la verdad histórica. Part I. Pablo Antonio Cuadra (*Universidad Católica Bolivariana*, Oct.).

Historia eclesiástica de la Amazonía Colombiana. Marcelino de Castellvi (*ibid.*).

Dom Vital, o Capuchinho. Jacinto de Pallazzolo, O.F.M.Cap., Alceu Amoroso Lima, and Luis Sucupira (*A Ordem*. Nov.).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Algermissen, Konrad, *Christian Denominations.* Trans. by Joseph W. Grudner. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1945. Pp. v, 1051. $7.50.)

Biggerstaff, Knight, *China: Revolutionary Changes in an Ancient Civilization.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1945. Pp. 78. 40¢) The associate professor of Chinese history at Cornell writes No. 4 of the University's Curriculum Series in World History. The brochure contains a select bibliography, study and discussion questions, and a pronunciation table of Chinese terms.

Bodin, John, *Method for the Easy Comprehension of History.* Trans. by Beatrice Reynolds. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1945. Pp. xxix, 402. $6.00.)

Borden, Lucille Papin, *Francesca Cabrini: Without Staff or Scrip.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1945. Pp. x, 402. $2.75.)

Bowers, Claude G., *The Young Jefferson.* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. 1945. Pp. xxx, 544. $3.75.)

Clavijero, Francisco J., *Historia antigua de México.* 2 vols. Trans. by J. Joaquín de Mora. (Mexico, D. F.: Editorial Delfin. 1944. Pp. 345; viii, 328. $20.00, Mexican.)

De Tocqueville, Alexis, *Democracy in America.* 2 vols. Henry Reeve text as revised by Francis Bowen and edited with notes by Phillips Bradley. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1945. Pp. cix, 434, xii; xiii, 401, x. $6.00.)

Doyle, Charles Hugo, *The Life of Pope Pius XII.* (New York: Didier, Publishers. 1945. Pp. x, 258. $3.00.)

Dunne, Peter Masten, *A Padre Views South America.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1945. Pp. xiii, 290. $2.50.)

Durkin, Joseph T. (Ed.), *John Dooley, Confederate Soldier: His War Journal* (Washington: Georgetown University Press. 1945. Pp. xxiv, 248. $3.00.)

Engel-Janosi, Friedrich, *The Growth of German Historicism.* Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series LXII, No. 2. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 1944. Pp. 101, xiv. $1.25.)

Goris, Jan-Albert (Ed.), *Belgium.* (Berkeley: University of California Press. 1945. Pp. xx, 478. $5.00.)

Heberle, Rudolf, *From Democracy to Nazism: A Regional Case Study on Political Parties in Germany.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1945. Pp. ix, 130. $2.50.)

Holmes, Margaret Cooper, *God's Sigh.* (Boston: Christopher Publishing House. 1945. Pp. 80. $1.50.)

Klimas, Petras, *Ghillebert de Lannoy in Medieval Lithuania: Voyages and Embassies of an Ancester of One of America's Great Presidents.* (New York: Lithuanian American Information Center. 1945. Pp. 96. $1.00.)

Leighton, Alexander H., *The Governing of Men.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1945. Pp. xvi, 404. $3.75.) Lieutenant-Commander Leighton of the Medical Corps here tells the story of a Japanese relocation camp with great detail and thoroughness.

Leonard, L. Larry, *International Regulation of Fisheries.* (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1944. Pp. x, 201. $2.00.)

Lunt, W. E., *History of England.* 3rd ed. (New York: Harper & Bros. 1945. Pp. xvi, 954.) Professor Lunt of Haverford College states concerning the third edition of his textbook: "The principal purpose of the third edition is to bring the period after 1918 up to date, but I have taken the opportunity to make some changes elsewhere in the text and in the Suggestions for Further Reading."

MacLean, Donald A., *A Dynamic World Order.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1945. Pp. xii, 235. $2.50.)

Masters, Ruth D. (Ed.), *Handbook of International Organizations in the Americas.* (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1945. Pp. xvi, 453. $5.00.)

May, Earl Chapin, *Principio to Wheeling, 1715-1945: A Pageant of Iron and Steel.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1945. Pp. xiv, 335. $3.00.)

Monaghan, Jay, *Diplomat in Carpet Slippers.* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co. 1945. Pp. 505. $4.00.)

Nasatir, Abraham P., *French Activities in California. An Archival Calendar-Guide.* (Stanford University: Stanford University Press, 1945. Pp. xiii, 559. $10.00.)

Neil, Thomas P., *Weapons for Peace.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1945. Pp. ix, 234. $2.50.)

Norlin, George, *The Quest of American Life.* University of Colorado Studies, Series B, II, 3. (Boulder: University of Colorado. 1945. Pp. xvi, 280.)

Odegaard, Charles Edwin, *Vassi and Fideles in the Carolingian Empire.* Harvard Historical Monographs, XIX. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1945. Pp. 166. $1.00.)

Schmiedeler, Edgar, O.S.B. (Ed.), *The Family Faces Forward.* (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference. 1945. Pp. 153.) The director of the Family Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference here edits the papers read at the second annual meeting of the Family Life Conference held at the Catholic University of America, January 30-February 2, 1945.

Schuyler, Robert Livingston, *The Fall of the Old Colonial System: A Study in British Free Trade, 1770-1870.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1945. Pp. vii, 344. $3.00.)

Sexton, John E., and Arthur J. Riley, *History of St. John's Seminary, Brighton.* (Boston: Roman Catholic Archbishop of Boston. 1945. Pp. 320. $1.50.)

Stroup, Herbert Hewitt, *The Jehovah's Witnesses.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1945. Pp. vii, 180. $2.50.)

Thrift, Charles T., Jr., *The Trail of the Florida Circuit Rider: An Introduction to the Rise of Methodism in Middle and East Florida.* (Lakeland: Florida Southern College Press. 1944. Pp. 168. $2.00, cloth.)

Thrift, Charles T., Jr. (Ed.), *Marshaling Florida's Resources.* (Lakeland: Florida Southern College Press. 1945. Pp. 96. $2.00, cloth.) A series of papers read in a conference at Florida Southern College dealing with various aspects of contemporary Florida life.

Wish, Harvey, *Contemporary America: The National Scene Since 1900.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1945. Pp. xvi, 657. $4.00.)